THE

BIBLE EXAMINER:

CONTAINING

VARIOUS PROPHETIC EXPOSITIONS.

BY GEORGE STORRS.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,
No. 14, Devonshire Street.
1843.

Digitized by Google

C 8606.5

The Gift of
The Editor,
the Rev. J. V. Himes,
of Boston.
Rec'd. Jan. 28.
1847.

31-174
33

Digitized by Google

C 8606.5

BOSTON:
DOW & JACKSON'S POWER PRESS.
14 Devonshire Street.

31-174
33

Digitized by Google

BIBLE EXAMINER.

MOST of the following articles were prepared for, and have appeared in, the Midnight Cry. They are now given in this new form *by request*. Some additions have been made to them; particularly to the Exposition of the 8th and 9th chapters of Daniel. These articles are sent forth with a full conviction that they may not travel far before our Lord will have come in the clouds of heaven; but still, they are sent under the conviction that the injunction of our Lord is to be regarded by all, viz., "*Occupy till I come;*" and, "Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing." GEO. STORRS.

BOSTON, *March*, 1843.

Exposition of Nebuchadnezzar's Dream.

DANIEL II.—BY GEORGE STORRS.

There are those who, when they come to hear anything on the appearing of Christ and the end of the world, expect to hear us *predict* and *prophesy* on those matters. With predicting and prophesying, in the

Digitized by Google

sense of foretelling future events, I have nothing to do. I take the prophecies that God has given us, and tell you *how* I understand them, and *why* I understand them as I do. When this is done, you will judge for yourselves, as each of you must give account for himself, whether the interpretation given accords with the general tenor of the Scriptures. I force not my exposition upon any man. Hear, then judge.

I cannot agree with some who tell us that the prophecies *cannot* be understood. I consider such language the language of *infidelity*. What is it but saying—"Revelation is *no Revelation?*" Revelation is something made known, and, of course, to be understood. To say, that any part of it cannot be understood, is, just so far, to be infidels. There are some men who denounce infidelity with an unsparing hand, who, at the same time, tell us, we cannot understand the prophecies! What is this but infidelity?

A man may say, with truth, that *he* does not understand the prophecies; but, to say, "they *cannot* be understood," is a very different matter; and he that does it, whatever his standing, or reputation, is infidel in his principles. Not that he rejects the *whole* of Revelation; but he denies that a part of the Bible is a revelation.

I most solemnly believe that God designed every part of the Bible should be understood; but not without searching the Scriptures, comparing one part with another, and earnest prayer to Him for that same Spirit, to guide us into truth, which at first inspired holy men to write the sacred pages. Hence, to come to a knowledge of the truth, we must first seek a childlike spirit, and pray much for divine aid. The blessed Jesus said—"I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the *wise* and *prudent*, and hast revealed them unto *babes*. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." First, an humble spirit is necessary. Then, for our encouragement, the Saviour has said, "If you, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your

Digitized by Google

children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him."

Let us then *humbly* yet *confidently* seek the aid of the Holy Spirit to give us understanding, and in that light search the Scriptures to know what was the mind of the Spirit that inspired them, and we shall not search in vain.

Let us now examine the *second* chapter of Daniel. I shall, for the sake of brevity, begin at the 31st verse.

Verses 31—36. "Thou, O king, sawest, and behold, a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible. This image's *head* was of fine gold—his *breast and arms* of silver—his belly and his thighs of brass—his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out, without hands, which smote the image *upon his feet* that were of iron and clay, and *brake them in pieces:* then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king."

I wish to call the attention of my readers to an inquiry. Where did the stone strike the image? "UPON HIS FEET." Let that be remembered, for I shall have occasion to speak of that fact again.

Verses 37, 38. "Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath *given thee* a *kingdom*, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven, hath he given into thy hand, and hath made thee ruler *over them all*," [i. e., has given thee *universal* dominion on earth.] "Thou art [i. e., thy kingdom is,] *this head of gold.*"

Babylon was the *first* kingdom of *universal empire.* It was founded by Nimrod, the great grandson of

Digitized by Google

Noah. See Genesis x. 8—10. It lasted near seventeen hundred years, though under different names; sometimes called Babylon, sometimes Assyria, and sometimes Chaldea. It extended from Nimrod to Belshazzar, who was its last king.

Verse 39, *first part*. "And after thee shall arise another *kingdom*, inferior to thee." What kingdom succeeded Babylon? See chapter v. 28: "Thy kingdom [Babylon] is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians."

The Medo-Persian kingdom, then, was the second *universal kingdom*, and was represented by the "breast and arms of silver."

Verse 39, *last part*. "And another *third* kingdom of brass shall arise, which shall bear *rule over all the earth*." What kingdom was this? See chapter viii. verses 5—7, 21. Here we learn that *Grecia* conquered the Medo-Persian kingdom and became a kingdom of *universal empire*. This took place under Alexander. Here, then, we have the *third* kingdom, which was represented by the *brass* of the image.

Verse 40. And the *fourth* kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise."

What kingdom is this? It is generally admitted to be the Roman kingdom. It is a universal kingdom, that is to break in pieces all that went before it. Rome alone answers the description. That did have universal empire. See Luke ii. 1. "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cesar Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed."—Who was Cesar Augustus? A Roman Emperor. Here, then, we have the *fourth* kingdom, represented by the "legs of iron."

Verse 41. "And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes part of potter's clay and part of iron, *the kingdom* shall be divided." *What kingdom* shall be divided? "The *fourth* kingdom." Was it divided? It was. The western empire of Rome, between the years

Digitized by Google

A. D. 356 and 483, was divided into *ten* divisions, or kingdoms, viz.: 1. The Huns in Hungary, A. D. 356. 2. The Ostrogoths, in Mysia, 377. 3. The Visigoths, in Pannonia, 378. 4. The Franks, in France, 407. 5. The Vandals, in Africa, 407. 6. The Sueves and Alans, in Gascoigne and Spain, 407. 7. The Burgundians, in Burgundy, 407. 8. The Heruli and Rugii, in Italy, 476. 9. The Saxons and Angles, in Britain, 476. 10. The Lombards, in Germany, 483.* Thus the "kingdom was divided" as designated by the *ten* "*toes*." "But," after its division, "there shall be in it the *strength of iron*, forasmuch as thou sawest the *iron mixed* with the miry clay."

The *Roman*, or "*iron*" power, through the influence and authority of *Papacy*, or *Papal Rome*, stretched itself among the "clay" so as to be "mixed with" it, and thereby kept up "the *strength of iron*."

Verses 42, 43. "And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay; so the kingdom" [Roman kingdom] "shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest *iron mixed* with miry clay, they" [Romanism] "shall mingle themselves" [i. e., Rome Papal] "with the seed of men; but they shall not *cleave one to another*, even as iron is not mixed with clay."

How exactly has all this been fulfilled. Romanism, or the Romish church, while it has mingled with all nations, has not mixed with them, but has kept up its authority over its subjects, under whatever government they may have been located; so that the authority of Rome has been felt by all the nations where her subjects have been "mingled with the seed of men." The fourth, or Roman, kingdom is thus *perpetuated*,

* This list is not made up for the occasion, nor is it given on doubtful authority. It is copied by Faber from the Italian historian, Machiavel, and quoted by the learned Dr. Scott, who introduces Faber's note applying the fourth beast, in the seventh of Daniel, to Rome, with the following endorsement: "His conclusion seems well grounded."

Digitized by Google

though "divided." That power will continue, not *civilly*, but by its *ecclesiastical* authority, till "broken without hands."

Verse 44. "And in the days of these kings [*What kings*, or kingdoms? Clearly, the kings of the *divided fourth* kingdom: for that is *now* the subject of discourse] shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom [the *fifth universal kingdom*] that shall *never* be destroyed: [and, therefore, must be in the *immortal* state, or "new earth"] and the kingdom [when set up] shall not be left to other people, [i. e., the subjects shall not pass from one set of rulers to another, as the *four* previous kingdoms have done,] but it shall *break in pieces* and consume all these kingdoms, [See Rev. xi. 15, "And the *seventh* angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." "And (18th verse) the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest *destroy* ('*break in pieces*') them that destroy ('*break in pieces.*' See Dan. vii. 23) the earth,] and it [the *fifth* kingdom] shall stand forever."

The question now arises, What are we to understand by this last kingdom? and *when* is it "set up?" Some tell us it must be the "kingdom of grace," because the stone that smote the image was a "*little stone*" at first. But where, I ask, do they learn that the stone was a little one? Not in the Bible, surely. It is not there. They must find it, then, among the inventions of men. "But," say they, "it *grows*, mark that." Well, my dear sir, will you be good enough to show me where the stone is said to *grow*? You do not find it in the Bible: it must be in your imagination, if anywhere. The "stone smote the image, and "it became like the *chaff* of the summer threshing-floors, and the wind carried" it "away,

Digitized by Google

that *no place* was found for" either of the four kingdoms: *then*, and not till then, "the stone became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."

Still, the objector insists upon it, that "it must be the *kingdom of grace*, set up by our Lord Jesus Christ 1800 years ago, in the days of the *Cesars*." You speak of the "kingdom of grace;" but, I ask, then, if God had no "kingdom of grace" in the world till "the days of the Cesars?" If he had not, then Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Job, and all the prophets, must have gone to *perdition*, for surely no man can be saved without *grace;* and that grace must *reign* to bring salvation. Thus if Jesus Christ set up "the kingdom of grace" only 1800 years ago, all that lived the 4000 years previous have "*perished*."

But let us look at this subject a little further. *Where* did the stone strike the image when it *smote* it? Not on the "*head*"—Babylon; nor on the "breast and arms"—Media and Persia; nor on the "belly and thighs"—Grecia; nor yet on the "*legs*"—Rome pagan, as it should have done, if the kingdom was "set up in the days of the Cesars." *Where*, then, did it smite the image? Verse 34 tells us, it "smote the image upon the FEET." Now it could not smite the feet before they were in being; and they were not in being till several hundred years after Christ's crucifixion, i. e., till the fourth, or Roman kingdom was *divided:* which, we have seen, did not take place till between the years A. D. 356 and 483. Since that time, the "*Man of Sin*" has reigned on earth, instead of the Lord of Glory, and has *trodden* "under foot the holy city"—the church. But the kingdom of God *is to be* set up. That it was not set up at certain periods spoken of in the New Testament, will appear from the examination of a few passages. It was not set up when our Lord taught his followers to pray, "Thy kingdom come:" it must have been future then.—Again. The mother of Zebedee's children understood it to be *future* when she desired our Lord to grant

Digitized by Google

that her two sons might sit, "the one on the right hand, and the other on the left, in *thy kingdom*." It was still future when our Lord ate the last passover. See Luke xxii. 18: "I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God *shall come*." So, it had not *then* come. Let us see if it had come when Christ hung on the cross. See Luke xxiii. 42: "Lord, remember me *when* thou *comest* into thy kingdom." Thus, to his death, it seems, his kingdom had not been set up.—But did he not set it up before his ascension to heaven? See Acts i. 6: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Not done yet. Now see 1 Cor. xv. 50: "Now this I say, brethren, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God*." This settles the question that the kingdom of God is not set up till the saints put on *immortality*, or not till they enter the *immortal state*, which Paul tells us, verse 52, is "at the *last trump*," and answers to Rev. xi. 15, which see; and the apostle Paul tells us, 2 Timothy iv. 1, that "the Lord Jesus Christ shall *judge* the quick and the dead at his *appearing and kingdom*." And again he tells us, Acts xiv. 22, that "We must through much tribulation *enter into the kingdom of God*," and this address was made to those who were already Christians, and shows that the kingdom of God was still future, in the apostle's estimation.

It is said, "Our Lord taught the Jews that the kingdom of God was within them." This is inferred from Luke xvii. 20, 21. "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation:" [marginal reading 'outward show.'] "Neither shall they say, lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." Did our Saviour mean to say that the kingdom of God was *within* the *Pharisees?* He says of them, Matt. xxiii. 13, "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." Surely

Digitized by Google

our Lord could not mean, in Luke xvii., to say, the kingdom of God was, at *that time*, within the Pharisees. "True," says the objector, "but the margin has it, *among* you." But, I ask, did our Lord intend to teach that it was *then* among them? If so, why did he speak a parable in the 19th chapter, 11th verse and onward, to disabuse the minds of the people, "because they thought that the kingdom of God should *immediately* appear?" He clearly teaches in that parable that they were not to expect the kingdom of God till he should "*return*" from heaven, at which time he would reward his *faithful servants*, but would say, at the same time, "Those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me." See, in connection with this, Rev. xi. 15, 18. What then does our Lord mean in Luke 17th? I understand him to say, that when the kingdom of God does come, it will not be with outward show, or signs; but, the first the wicked will know, it is upon them; and thus the twenty-fourth verse seems to explain it. "For as the lightning ——so also shall the Son of man be in his day." That kingdom will come *sudden* and *unexpected* to all the wicked.

The parables of the "mustard seed" and "leaven," are brought forward as an argument in defence of the doctrine that the kingdom of heaven was set up in the days our Saviour was on earth. I admit that those parables refer to a work of grace wrought in this world; but they cannot be so interpreted as to contradict the overwhelming testimony of our Lord, the prophet Daniel, Paul, and St. John, as already presented. The language of these parables must, to harmonize with the other Scriptures, be understood as spoken in a *borrowed* sense; that is, as the grace of God, in men, works that preparation which is necessary to constitute us, finally, subjects of the kingdom of heaven, so it is called "the kingdom of heaven," in relation to the *result*. In the same way I understand the text, Rom. xiv. 17.

Digitized by Google

"But," says the objector, "Christ and the apostles preached the kingdom of heaven at *hand;* surely, therefore, it must have been set up about that time." I reply,—A thing *at hand* is the *next to come.* Let me ask, what kingdom was *at hand* when Babylon was in power? *Answer.*—The Medo-Persian. Why? Because it was next to come. What kingdom was at hand when the Medo-Persian was in power? *Answer.*—The Grecian. Why? Because it was next to succeed it. What kingdom was at hand when Grecia was in power? Rome. Why? Because next to come, as a kingdom of universal empire. What kingdom is at hand when Rome is in power? *God's everlasting kingdom.* Why? Because that is the next kingdom of universal empire. Thus we see how it could be said, in truth, the kingdom of heaven is at hand in the very commencement of the Roman kingdom.

James, ii. 5, tells us that the kingdom is a matter of *promise* to them that *love* God; of course, if "promised," it was future. Our Saviour saith, Luke xii. 32, "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom;" not *yet* given. It is something still to come. To represent it as already set up, is to take away one of the strongest motives the Bible furnishes to endure trials, and to suffer patiently while in an enemy's country. What a soul-cheering thought, the kingdom of God *is* to come. Christ's subjects will be gathered out of all their tribulations—his territory, the earth, will be *cleansed,* and the wicked rooted out of it; and Christ himself *personally* reign over his people forever; not in a *dying* state, but in a state of *immortality,* peace, and glory, in the new earth. Such a thought gives new life to the soul, now struggling in this "tabernacle," *groaning,* "being burdened." The kingdom will come; yea, it is now *at the door.* "Ye feeble saints, fresh courage take." "Behold, your God will come with vengeance [to your enemies,] even God with a recompense; *he will come and save you.*" Isa. xxxv. 4.

Digitized by Google

But *when* will the kingdom of God be set up? See Matthew xxv. 31—34: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the *throne* of his glory. *Then* shall the *King* say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit the kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Then, and not till then, will the kingdom of God be set up on earth; for, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," as we have already seen; and that kingdom is not set up till the "seventh angel" sounds his "trumpet." Rev. xi. 15—18.

Some men will not enter the kingdom of God. See 1 Cor. vi. 9, 16: "Know you not that the *unrighteous* shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor *covetous*, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God." See, also, Rev. xxi. 27: "And there shall *in no wise* enter into it [the new Jerusalem] anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie."

Who will be subjects of this kingdom? See Rev. xx. 6: "Blessed and *holy* is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall *reign* with him," &c. Here it is seen that *holiness* is the indispensable qualification for an inheritance in the kingdom of God. See 2 Peter iii. 14: "Wherefore, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye be found of him in peace *without spot* and blameless." There must be no *spot of known* sin upon us if we would enter the kingdom of God. Again, John iii. 3: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The new birth, then, is indispensable to a part in the kingdom of God. See also 1 John iii. 2, 3: "We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And

Digitized by Google

every man that hath this hope in him, *purifieth himself, even as he is pure.*"

Are we thus purifying ourselves? Are we striving to be Christ-like? Have we the same love to God? The same love to men? The same hatred to sin? The same deadness to the applause of men? In short, do we set Christ before our eyes as our pattern and example? And are we, from *beholding*, changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of God? "He that saith, he abideth in him, ought himself also to walk even as he walked." See 1 John ii. 6. See also Matt. xxv. 34—36. Here we learn who will enter into the kingdom of God.

Now comes the inquiry, "Watchman, what of the night?" In what period of prophecy are we now? What are our "soundings," in relation to the setting up of this kingdom? Are we in the kingdom of Babylon, under the "head of gold?" No. That has passed long ago.—Are we in the Medo-Persian empire? No. Long since that kingdom was numbered with things past. Are we in Grecia? Certainly not. That too was numbered and finished more than two thousand years since. Are we in Rome in its undivided state, or in the "*legs of iron?*" No. Long since that empire fell. Where are we, then? Down among the *feet and toes*. How long since those divisions came up which constitute the feet and toes? Nearly fourteen hundred years! Almost fourteen hundred years we have travelled down in the divided state of the Roman empire. Where does the *stone* strike the image? Is it on the *head?* No. Is it on the *breast and arms?* No. Is it on the *belly and thighs?* No. Is it on the *legs?* No. Where then? On the *feet*. Where are we now? In the *feet*. What takes place when the stone smites the image? It is all broken to pieces, and becomes like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, and the wind carries it away that *no place shall be found for it*. Then will this world be cleansed and the everlasting kingdom of God set up which shall *never be destroyed*. How far

Digitized by Google

off, reader, do you think that event can be? What is to come *next* as the subject of prophecy? *The stone.* Are you ready? The Lord help thee to be awake.—Suffer not thyself to be lulled to sleep by the cry of, "My Lord delayeth his coming."

Exposition of Daniel 7th Chapter;

OR, VISION OF THE FOUR BEASTS.—BY G. STORRS.

In communicating instruction to the children of men, God is pleased to give "line upon line, precept upon precept—here a little, and there a little." The Saviour saith, John xvi. 12, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*." Revelation has been not only *progressive*, but the same truths have been *repeated* again and again, under different figures, emblems, and forms of speech. As a kind parent enforces important truths upon the minds of his offspring, illustrating and repeating to make the deeper impression, so our Heavenly Father labors to impress our minds with truths connected with, and having a bearing on, our eternal destiny, and necessary to establish the faith of his people, and inspire in them confidence in his word. He has given them waymarks to determine the truth of his word, and to mark the period of the world in which they are living, and to show them that their Heavenly Father was perfectly acquainted with all the *road* his church would have to travel to the end of the world, and the termination of all their labors and sufferings.

To illustrate. Suppose you were travelling a road with which you were unacquainted. You inquire of a stranger—he tells you, that road leads to a glorious city, filled with every good thing, governed by the most lovely, mild, and benevolent Prince that the world ever

Digitized by Google

saw; that in that city there was neither sickness, sorrow, pain, nor death. He then proceeds to tell you what you may expect to pass on the road, by which you may know he has told you the truth, and which will mark the progress you have made. First, then, he tells you, after leaving him, and travelling awhile, you will come to a monument that can be seen at a great distance; on the top of it you will see a "lion" having "eagle's wings;"—at a distance beyond that, you will come to another monument, having on it "a bear" with "three ribs in his mouth:"—passing on still, you will at length arrive at a third monument, on the top of which you will behold a "leopard" having "four wings of a fowl" and "four heads:"—after that, you will come to a fourth, on which is a beast "dreadful and terrible," with "great iron teeth" and "ten horns:"—and lastly, you will come to another place, where you will see the same beast, with this difference —"three" of its "first horns" have been "plucked up," and in the place of them has come up a peculiar horn, having "eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth." The next thing you will look for, after passing the last-mentioned sign, is the city of which I have told you.

With these directions you commence your journey. What do you look for first? The lion. At length you see it. That inspires in you some faith in the person's knowledge and truth who had directed you. Having passed that sign, the next thing you expect to see, as marked in the directions, is the bear. At length you come in sight of that. "There," say you, "is the second sign he gave me. He must have been perfectly acquainted with this road, and has told me the truth." Your faith increases as you travel on. What next do you look for? Not the city, certainly. "No," say you, "I look for the leopard." Well, by and by you behold that, in the distance. "There it is," you cry; "now I know he has told me the truth, and it will come out just as he said." Is the next thing you look for now, the city? No—you look for that "terrible

Digitized by Google

beast" with "ten horns." You pass that, and say as you pass, "How exactly the man who directed me described everything." Now your faith is so confirmed that you *almost see* the city; "but," say you, "I have got one more sign to pass, viz. the 'horn' with 'eyes'—*then* the city comes next." Now hope is high, and your anxious eyes gaze with intense interest for the last sign. That comes in view, and you exclaim in raptures, "There it is!" All doubt is now removed—you look for no more signs—your longing eyes are fixed to gaze on the "glorious city" next—and probably no man now, however wise he might profess himself, could make you discredit what your director had told you. "The city—*the city*," is now fixed in your eye, and onward you go, hasting to your rest.

Now, if we find, on examination, that all the events or signs that God has given us, which were to precede the judgment day and the setting up of his everlasting kingdom, have actually transpired, or come to view, what are we to look for next? Most clearly, the judgment of the great day! Let us, then, examine the chapter before us.

Verse 1. "In the first year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, Daniel had a dream, and visions of his head, upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, [thus it became a part of the Scriptures] and told the sum of the matters."

V. 2 *and* 3. "Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and behold the four winds [denoting commotions] of the heaven strove upon the great sea, (*waters*, denoting "people." See Rev. xvii. 15,) and four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another." The angel explains these four beasts to be "four kings, verse 17, or four *kingdoms*, as you will see verse 23. "The fourth beast is the fourth kingdom," &c.; which shows that the term *king*, in these visions, signifies kingdom.

V. 4. "The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings:" Babylon, as described in this vision. We have

Digitized by Google

already seen, chapter ii. 38, that Babylon was the first universal "kingdom upon earth;" aptly represented here by a lion—"the king of beasts," denoting the glory of that kingdom, and corresponding with the "head of gold" in the second chapter—the "eagle's wings" denoting the rapidity of its conquests, and the soaring pride of its monarchs. It is described by Habakkuk, chapter i. 6—8, "For, lo! I raise up the Chaldeans [Babylon]—they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat." See Isa. v. 26, 29, and Jer. iv. 7; also, Ezek. xvii. 3, 4. Daniel goes on to say—"I beheld till the wings thereof were *plucked*, wherewith* it was lifted from the earth, [its glory departed,] and it was made to stand upon its feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it." This may refer to the humiliation of the proud monarch of Babylon, chapter iv. 31—37, or to the cowardice of Belshazzar, who, instead of driving away his foes like a lion, shut himself up in the city, feasting and drinking with his lords, till he was killed, and the kingdom was given to the Medes and Persians.

V. 5. "And behold, another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, [representing two lines of kings, one much longer than the other,] and it had three ribs in the mouth of it, between the teeth of it; and they said unto it, Arise, devour much flesh."

We have already seen that the Medo-Persian kingdom succeeded Babylon, and is clearly the kingdom here described. It was noted for cruelty and thirst of blood, and the nation is emphatically called "the spoiler." See Jer. li. 48—56. The three "ribs" in its mouth may denote the union of Media, Persia, and Chaldea. It subdued many and populous kingdoms. Ahasuerus, or Artaxerxes, reigned over 127 provinces. See Esther i. 1.

V. 6. "After this I beheld, and lo, another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a

* See the marginal reading.

Digitized by Google

fowl; the beast had also four heads, and dominion was given to it." There can be no dispute with respect to this being Grecia; "four wings" denoting the rapidity of its conquest under Alexander; the "four heads" its division into four parts after Alexander died and his posterity were murdered.

V. 7 *and* 8. "After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things." On these verses I shall remark when I come to consider the angel's explanation.

V. 9 *and* 10. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." If we have not here a description of the final judgment, we may despair of finding any such description in the book of God. There is nothing clearer.

V. 11. "I beheld then [*When?* Ans. When 'the judgment set'] because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake, I beheld till the beast was slain, [What beast? Ans. The fourth beast, on which the horn had stood,] and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." That is the punishment of the beast for having sustained and carried the little horn. Nothing is said of "the dominion" of this beast being

Digitized by Google

"taken away," as is said of the others. The others lost their dominion after a time, but their subjects survived and were transferred to the succeeding governments, but the very *body* [subjects] of this fourth kingdom is destroyed, and given to the burning flame; as Isaiah saith, (xxxiii. 12,) "The people shall be as the burnings of lime; as thorns cut up shall they be burned in the fire." No transferring of its subjects to another kingdom. *Then* "The wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Prov. ii. 22. *Then* God will "destroy them which destroy [corrupt] the earth." Revel. xi. 18. But—

V. 12. "As concerning the rest of the beasts, *they* had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time." [Babylon ruled about 1700 years—Media and Persia about 200—Grecia about 175.] These kingdoms successively lost the dominion, but the lives of the respective nations were prolonged, being merged in the succeeding governments.

V. 13 *and* 14. "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."—Thus we see the kingdom of God, or of Christ, is not set up till the "judgment sits;" hence no room for a temporal millennium *before* the judgment, and before the kingdoms of this world are destroyed. "All people, nations, and languages," that shall "serve him," are described by the Revelator, chapter v. 9, 10, as "redeemed OUT OF every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," &c.

V. 15—18. "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head

Digitized by Google

troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." Not a "thousand years," but *forever*, even FOREVER and EVER."- If any language can express *unending* duration, this must do so. Some think the language too strong to be applied to a thousand years, and so make it mean "three hundred and sixty thousand years." But that is infinitely short of "forever, even forever and ever."

V. 19—25. "Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet: and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time."

Digitized by Google

There is but little dispute about what is here meant by the "fourth kingdom." No kingdom that ever has existed on earth will answer to it, except the Roman kingdom. That has been, truly, "diverse from all kingdoms," especially in its forms of government, which were not less than seven—being, at different times, Republican, Consular, Tribune, Decemvirate, Dictatorial, Imperial and Kingly. It was at length divided into the Eastern and Western empires; Rome proper being in the Western empire. Between the years A. D. 356 and 483, it was divided into ten kingdoms, as I have noticed in my remarks on chapter ii.; thus the "ten horns are ten kings" [kingdoms] that arose out of this empire, and are the same that John saw, Rev. xii. 3, "a great red dragon having seven heads and ten horns;" and, chapter xvii. 12, he is told—"The ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet:"—it was something still future in John's time.

We are now prepared for the inquiry—*who*, or *what* is the little horn here spoken of? We will inquire,

1st. *What is the character of this horn?* 1. It makes "*war with the saints.*" 2. It speaks great words against the Most High.

Let us see if we can find a description of the same character elsewhere in the Bible. See Rev. xiii. 6, 7: "And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make *war with the saints* and to *overcome* them:"—Daniel says, he "*prevailed* against them." Now see 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4: "That *man of sin* be revealed, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God," &c. Can there be any doubt of the identity of the character? Daniel's "little horn"—Paul's "man of sin"—and John's "blasphemous beast" are clearly identified.

2d. Let us inquire, has a power of this description arisen? It must be admitted that there has; and that

Digitized by Google

that power is *Papacy*. The *titles* the Popes have assumed, of "MOST HOLY LORD," and their pretensions to *pardon sin*, even *before* its commission, if we had nothing else, sufficiently establishes the *blasphemous* character of that power. Pope Innocent III. writes—"He [Christ] hath set *one man* over *the world*, him whom he hath appointed his *vicar on earth*; and *as to Christ is bent every knee in heaven*, in earth and under the earth, *so shall obedience and service* be paid *to his vicar by all*, that there may be one fold and one shepherd." Again, Pope Gregory VII. says, "The Roman Pontiff alone is by right *universal*. In him alone is the right of making laws. Let all kings kiss the feet of the Pope. His name *alone* shall be heard in the churches. It is the ONLY NAME IN THE WORLD. It *is his right to depose kings*. His word is not to be repealed by any one. It is to be repealed by himself alone. He is to be judged by none. The church of Rome has never erred; and the Scriptures testify it never shall err." Surely here is a power "*diverse* from" all others, and proud and *blasphemous* enough to answer the character of the "little horn."

3d. Let us now inquire, *When this little horn arose?* Or, which is the same thing, *When did Papacy arise?* There has been a difference of opinion on that question. But it appears to me the question is not one so difficult to settle now as in former years. First, then—it did not arise before the *ten* horns. Hence it did not arise *before* A. D. 483, when the tenth horn came up. It did not arise until "*three* of the first horns" *fell*, or were "plucked up." It did not come up *after* that, because it "came up *among*" the "ten horns," and three of those horns fell "*before*" it. It must then have come up or been established at the *identical point* where the *third* horn fell. If that point can be settled, it seems to me there can be no reasonable doubt as to the *time* Papacy arose. In the year of our Lord 493, the Heruli in Rome and Italy were conquered by the Ostrogoths. In 534, the Vandals, who were under *Arian* influence, were conquered by the Greeks, for the

Digitized by Google

purpose of establishing the supremacy of the Catholics. The Ostrogoths, who held possession of Rome, were under an Arian monarch, who was an enemy to the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome; hence, before the decree of Justinian, (a Greek emperor at Constantinople,) could be carried into effect, by which he had constituted the Bishop of Rome "*head of all the churches*," the Ostrogoths must be *plucked up*. This conquest was effected by Justinian's army in the month of March, 538; at which time, the Ostrogoths, who had retired without the city, and besieged it in their turn, raised the siege and retired, leaving the Greeks in possession of the city: thus the *third horn* was plucked before Papacy, and for the express purpose too of establishing that power. [See Gibbon's Decline and Fall of Roman Empire.]

How exactly do the *facts* answer to the *prophecy!* I will here introduce the letter of Justinian to the Bishop of Rome, of A. D. 533:

"Justinian, pious, fortunate, renowned, triumphant, emperor, consul, &c., to John, the most holy Archbishop of our city of Rome, and patriarch:

"Rendering honor to the apostolic see, and to your holiness, (as *always* was and is our desire,) and, as it becomes us, honoring your blessedness as a father, we have laid without delay before the notice of your holiness all things pertaining to the state of the church. *Since it has always been our earnest study to preserve the unity of your holy see*, and the state of the holy churches of God, which has hitherto obtained, and will remain, without any interfering opposition; therefore we hasten to SUBJECT, *and to unite to your holiness, all the priests of the whole East*. As to the matters which are presently agitated, although clear and undoubted, and, according to the doctrine of your apostolic see, held assuredly resolved and decided by all priests, we have yet deemed it necessary to lay them before your holiness. Nor do we suffer anything which belongs to the state of the church, however manifest and undoubted, that is agitated, to pass without the knowledge of

Digitized by Google

your holiness, *who are the head of all the holy churches.* For in all things (as had been said or resolved) we are prompt to increase the honor and authority of your see."

"The authenticity of the title," says Mr. Croley, "receives unanswerable proof from the edicts of the 'Novellæ' of the Justinian code. The preamble of the 9th states, 'that as the elder Rome was the founder of the laws; so was it not to be questioned, that in her was the supremacy of the pontificate.' The 131st, on the Ecclesiastical Titles and Privileges, chapter ii., states: 'We therefore decree that the most holy Pope of the elder Rome is the first of all the priesthood, and that the most blessed archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, shall hold the second rank, after the holy apostolic chair of the elder Rome.'" *Croley, pp.* 114, 115.

Some suppose that Phocas, A. D. 606, by applying the title "universal Bishop" to the Pope, first gave him his supremacy: but this cannot be, for it does not agree with the prophecy that three of the *first* horns were to be plucked up *before* it, as it came up, and this happened more than half a century before. Again, Mr. Croley, a writer of the Church of England, says—"The highest authorities among the civilians and annalists of Rome spurn the idea that Phocas was the founder of the supremacy of Rome; they ascend to Justinian, as the only legitimate source, and rightly date the title from the memorable year 533."

Imperial Rome fell about A. D. 475, and was in the hands of the barbarians. Thus it continued till the conquest of Rome by Belisarius, Justinian's general, 536 to 538, when the Ostrogoths left it in possession of the Greek emperor, March, 538. Thus the way was open for the "*dragon*" to give the "*beast his power, and his seat, and great authority.*" Rev. xiii. 2. This fact, from Revelation, also, settles the point that the Pope did not receive his power from Clovis, king of France. It was the "Dragon" that gave him "*his seat*"—Rome, "*his power,*" as head of the

Digitized by Google

churches. The Roman emperors had stood at the head of the churches with "*power*" to make important decisions for the church—it is now transferred to the Pope: and he has given him, also, "*great authority*," under the Justinian code of laws, to judge and punish heretics.

4th. The next point we want to settle is, *the length of time this power was to continue.* Daniel says, "a time, times, and the dividing of time." The Revelator says, chap. xiii. 5, "Power was given unto him to continue 42 months." He was to make war upon the saints—the church; and in Rev. xii. 6, we are told, "the woman," the church, "fled into the wilderness" 1260 days; and at the 14th verse, that it was for "a time, and times, and a half time." Here then we have the period of the continuance of this power given us in three forms of expression, which settles the point that the time, times and dividing of time is 42 months, or 1260 prophetic days or years.

5th. Did the continuance of papal *dominion*, as a horn of the beast, cease at the end of that period? 1260 years from 538 would extend to 1798. Did anything transpire that year to justify the belief that the *dominion* of Papacy was taken away that year? It is a historical fact that, on Feb. 10th, 1798, Berthier, a French general, entered the city of Rome and took it. On the 15th of the same month the Pope was taken prisoner and shut up in the Vatican. The papal government, which had continued from the time of Justinian, was abolished, and a republican form of government given to Rome. The Pope was carried captive to France, where he died in 1799. Thus, "he that" led others "into captivity," went "into captivity;" and he who *killed* "with the sword" those he was pleased to call heretics, was himself "killed [subdued] with the sword;" i. e., his "dominion was taken away" by war. See Rev. xiii. 10. Verse 26: "But the judgment shall sit, and they [the kings that 'hate the whore,' Rev. xvii. 16] shall take away his *dominion*, [he is cut off from being a *horn on the beast*, or

Digitized by Google

deprived of his *civil power*, so that he can no longer wield the sword against dissenters] to consume and destroy it unto the end." See 2 Thess. ii. 8: "Whom the Lord shall *consume* with the spirit of his mouth [the "Reformation"] and shall *destroy* with the brightness of his coming" to judge the world in the great *burning day*, when the "beast and false prophet" will be "*cast alive* into the lake of fire, burning with brimstone;" then the "little horn" will be *destroyed*.

Some tell us the civil power of Papacy is not taken away. That the Pope was restored, or a new one chosen, is admitted, and that he may have some civil power in Italy is not denied. But that he has power to depose kings and put to death the saints now, *is* denied. When he was a *horn* on the beast, he deposed kings at pleasure, for centuries, and silenced "heretics" by the flame, the rack, prison, and the sword. Can he do it now? *No*. Nor has he been able to do it since 1798—since that time the church is *out of the "wilderness;"* and Papacy is *compelled* to tolerate Protestantism. Hear the Pope himself on that subject. Here is his letter, dated Sept., 1840, at Rome. Read it, and see if you think Papacy is now a horn on the beast, or is possessed of power to war against the saints unto death, as formerly.

"ENCYLLICAL LETTER of Our MOST HOLY LORD GREGORY XVI. by Divine Providence Pope, to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops.

GREGORY XVI. POPE.

"Venerable Brethren,—Health and the apostolic Benediction.

"You will know, Venerable Brothers, how great are *the calamities with which the Catholic Church is beset on all sides in this most sorrowful age, and how pitifully she is afflicted*. You know by what a deluge of errors of every kind, and with what unbridled audacity of the erroneous, our Holy Religion is attacked, and how cunningly and by what frauds heretics and

Digitized by Google

infidels are endeavoring to prevert the hearts and minds of the faithful. In a word, you know there is almost no kind of effort or machination which is not employed, to overthrow, from its deepest foundations, if it were possible, the immovable edifice of the Holy City.

"Indeed, are we not, (Oh, how shameful!) compelled to see the most crafty enemies of the truth ranging far and wide with impunity; not only attacking religion with ridicule, the church with contumely, and Catholics with insults and slander, but even entering into cities and towns, establishing schools of error and impiety, publishing in print the poison of their doctrines, skilfully concealed under the deceitful veil of the natural sciences and new discoveries, and even penetrating into the cottages of the poor, travelling through rural districts, and insinuating themselves into familiar acquaintance with the lowest of the people and with the farmers! Thus they leave no means unattempted, whether by corrupt Bibles in the language of the people, or pestiferous newspapers and other little publications, or caviling conversation, or pretended charity, or, finally, by the gift of money, to allure ignorant people, and especially youth, into their nets, and induce them to desert the Catholic faith.

"We refer to facts, Venerable Brethren, which not only are known to you, but of which you are witnesses; even you, who, though you mourn, and, as your pastoral duty requires, are by no means silent, are yet *compelled to tolerate* in your diocess these aforesaid *propagators of heresy and infidelity;* these shameless preachers, who, while they walk in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves, cease not to lay in wait for the flock and tear it in pieces. Why should we say more? There is now scarcely a barbarous region in the universal world, to which the well known Central Boards of the heretics and unbelievers have not, regardless of expense, sent out their explorers and emissaries, who either insidiously, or openly and in concert, making war upon the Catholic religion, its pastors and its ministers, tear the faithful out of the

Digitized by Google

bosom of the church, and intercept her approach to the infidels.

"Hence it is easy to conceive *the state of anguish into which our soul is plunged day and night*, as we, being charged with the superintendence of the whole fold of Jesus Christ, and the care of all the churches, must give account for his sheep to the Divine Prince of Pastors. And we have thought fit, Venerable Brethren, to recall to your minds by our present letter the causes of those troubles which are common to us and you, that you may more attentively consider how important it is to the church, that all holy priests should endeavor, with redoubled zeal, and with united labors, and with every kind of efforts, to repel the attacks of the raging foes of religion, to turn back their weapons, and to forewarn and fortify the subtle blandishments which they often use. This, as you know, we have been careful to do at every opportunity; nor shall we cease to do it; as we also are not ignorant that you have always done it hitherto, and confidently trust that you will do hereafter with still more earnest zeal.

* * * * * *

"Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, on the 18th of the Kalends of September, of the year 1840, the tenth of our pontificate.

GREGORY XVI. POPE."

You see what is to come next after the fall of the "little horn."

Now let us see whereabouts we are in the prophetic chain. Have we passed the "Lion"—Babylon? *Yes.* Have we gone by the "Bear with three ribs in his mouth?" *Yes.* Has the sign of the "Leopard with four wings of a fowl and four heads" been passed? *It has.* The "dreadful and terrible beast, with *ten horns*,"—has he been seen? *Yes.* Have we got past the "little horn" having "eyes like the eyes of a man?" *That* is among the things numbered with *the past.* How far beyond it are we? *Forty-five years*, nearly. What comes next? *The Judgment*, followed by the ever-

Digitized by Google

lasting kingdom of God. How far off is that? That question I shall answer, hereafter, DEFINITELY. But one thing is certain; it cannot be at a great distance. It is the NEXT prophetic event. Awake, ye slumbering virgins! "Behold the Bridegroom cometh go ye out to meet him." No time to sleep now. The seventh angel is preparing to sound. "AWAKE, YE DEAD!" will soon thunder through the skies, *Happy* day to those that are *waiting*. *Awful* day to those who are saying—"My Lord *delayeth his coming*." AWAKE—AWAKE!!!

Exposition of Daniel, 8th Chapter;

OR,

THE VISION OF THE RAM, HE-GOAT, AND EXCEEDING GREAT HORN.

BY GEO. STORRS.

I have already remarked, elsewhere, that our Heavenly Father employs various figures and representations, to enforce the *same* truths, to make the deeper impression on our minds. Thus the *dream* of Pharaoh, Genesis xli. 1—7, was *doubled* to him, thereby making the stronger impression on his spirit. In the vision of Peter, Acts x. 9—16, the "sheet was let down to the earth," and the voice *three* times calls upon him to "rise, kill and eat;" and as many times tells him, "What God has cleansed, that call not thou common." Thus God enforces important truths by a *repetition*. This was the case in the visions of Daniel. We have already seen that the vision of the *seventh chapter* was like that of the *second*, with, however, additional circumstances, *viz.*, the sitting of the judgment, and the "little horn." In the last chapter, then, while the *same* truths are brought to light as in the *second*, we have some additional information: so, we may see the same principle carried forward in the chapter before us.

Digitized by Google

Verses 2—4. "And I saw in a vision; (and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan, in the palace, which is in the province of Elam;) and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river Ulai. Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns; and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great."

The angel informs Daniel, at the 20th verse, "The ram which thou sawest, having two horns, are the kings [kingdoms] of Media and Persia." Thus it exactly agrees with, or is *like* the "breast and arms" of the image, chapter ii., and the "bear" in the seventh chapter. Daniel sees nothing of Babylon in this vision: that was now passing away; and his attention was particularly called to the "ram *pushing*." It would seem that that circumstance was to mark the *commencement* of the vision.

Verses 5—8. "And as I was considering, behold, a he-goat came from the west, on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power. And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns; and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him; and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand. Therefore, the he-goat waxed very great; and when he was strong the great horn was broken; and for it, came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven."

The angel explains this, verses 21 and 22. "And the rough goat is the king [kingdom] of Grecia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first

Digitized by Google

king;" not Alexander *merely*, as some suppose, for Alexander was not strictly the *first king;* but he belonged to the kingdom in its *undivided* state, or to the first part of the kingdom of Grecia. The great horn, then, I consider as a representation of Grecia while it was *united in one*, which *union* continued some years after Alexander's death, say fifteen or twenty, when his brother and two sons, who succeeded him, at least nominally, were murdered, and the kingdom was divided, as indicated at verse 22.—"Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four *kingdoms* [not *kings*, as some try to make us think] shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power," [not in the power of Grecia *united*.]

Alexander conquered a part of Europe and all Asia in the short space of about twelve years; and the kingdom under him may well be represented as *running* in the "*fury*" of its power, and "touching not the ground." With an army of not more than *thirty* thousand, he overthrew Darius, king of Persia, who had *six hundred* thousand, and thus "brake his two horns," or overthrew the Medo-Persian kingdom: then Grecia became a kingdom of universal empire. Alexander dies, and within twenty years after, four kingdoms come up in Grecia, *viz.*, Macedonia, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt.

Thus we see, the vision is *like* the "leopard" of the previous vision, and the "brass" division of the image.

The evidence thus far is so clear that this vision is *like* the two previous ones, that some of our opponents have admitted that the angel has clearly shown us so; but one of our opponents, when he has arrived at this point, says—"*Here the heavenly messenger leaves us.*" I do not wonder he thought so; for he then goes on to apply the horn that "*waxed exceeding great*" to *little* Antiochus. It would seem *that* author recorded *one* truth. It appears clear, to my mind, that the *heavenly messenger* left *him*, but he did not leave Daniel till he made him understand *the vision*. Let us now proceed to, and examine this point.

Verses 9—12. "And out of one of them came forth

Digitized by Google

a little horn, which waxed exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And a host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered."

The angel explains these verses thus—

Verses 23—25. "And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand."

Now, the question arises, who, or what power is here brought to view?

So far as I know, there are but *three* opinions. The first is, that it is Antiochus Epiphanes, one of the kings of Syria. The second is, that it is Mahomedanism; and the third, that it is Rome, Pagan and Papal. Each of these I shall examine.

I. *Mahomedanism.* This is the opinion of Faber, followed by some others. I conceive it cannot be Mahomedanism; *first*—because the "little horn stood" up against the Prince of princes, v. 25, and Mahomedanism itself did not stand up till about 600 years after Christ. If it be said, it stood up against *the church*, and therefore may be said to stand up against the Prince of princes, because our Lord considers that done against himself which is done unto his people—I reply, *that*

Digitized by Google

interpretation, in this case, would make the prophecy use a vain *repetition;* for, it *expressly* says, it "shall destroy the mighty and holy people." Now, Mahomedanism neither stood up against Christ, *in person*, nor did it destroy the holy people. For this assertion I have something more than the word of man. "Let God be true" though every man should be proved a "liar." All admit that Rev. 9th chapter is a description of Mahomedanism. Read the *fourth* verse of that chapter, and see if Mahomedanism stood up against the *true church of God.* "It was *commanded* them [Mahomedans] that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree; but [*mark it*] *only* those men WHO HAVE NOT the *seal of God* in their foreheads." Here then is evidence, strong as the truth of God, that Mahomedanism was not to hurt the *true church;* and, of course, did not "stand up against the Prince of princes" in any sense to answer the application of the text in Daniel to that power.

II. The next opinion I shall examine is, that it is Antiochus Epiphanes, one of the kings that ruled, for a time, over one of the "four horns," *viz.*, over Syria.

To this interpretation I urge the following objections—

1. Such an interpretation does *violence* to the whole subject. How is this vision *like* the previous, if Antiochus is the "little horn?" We have seen that it exactly agrees with the previous visions hitherto; and we see also that the little horn extends down to the end of this vision. If, then, Antiochus is the little horn, it is not *like* the other vision by more than *two thousand years;* for, Antiochus died 164 years before Christ was born.

2. This "little horn," as I have said, ends the vision, v. 17: "For at [unto] the time of the end shall be the vision." *What end?* Evidently the *end* spoken of in the vision it is *like*, chap. vii. 26—"They shall take away his dominion, to consume and *destroy* unto the *end*." 2 Thess. ii.: "That wicked, whom the Lord

Digitized by Google

shall destroy with the brightness of *his coming*." The *end*, when the Lord Jesus will be revealed from heaven.

3. Again—This little horn was to extend to "the *last end* of the *indignation*." Surely, none will pretend the *death* of Antiochus was the last end of indignation, even to the Jews. If they do, let them cease to talk of the great tribulation at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

4. The attempt to apply the 2300 days of this vision to Antiochus, has been a total failure. Those who make this attempt cannot agree among themselves how to reckon the time; some of them maintaining that the days are *entire* days, and others, that they are to be reckoned half days, or 1150 days, because the expression in the original is 2300 "*evening-mornings*." But let them count as they will, they cannot match it with Antiochus. Professor Stuart admits that the time is 2300 *entire* days; but after attempting to match them with Antiochus he has totally failed. He *reckons back* from the cleansing of the sanctuary by Judas Maccabeus, after it had been polluted by Antiochus, and he *finds what?* Why, he finds the ☞*5th of August*, 171 B. C. !!!☜ Yes, reader, he finds that marvellous day, but he finds *no event* to mark that as the beginning of the 2300 days. Perhaps he thought it would be taken for granted that it *must* begin then. Now if "Millerites," as they are called by their opponents, should attempt to make their theories pass by such an argument, we should scarcely get the people to hear us more than once, and they would justly accuse us of an attempt to impose upon them. Show us *facts*, from history, that the 2300 days begun when you "*guess*" they did; till then we deny that there is a particle of proof that the 5th of August, 171 B. C., is marked with anything that could show that to be the beginning of those days.

Mr. Dowling, the mouth-piece of most of our opponents, makes 1150 days of the 2300; and when he has attempted to match that number with the history

Digitized by Google

of Antiochus, he comes out within about 55 days of making *a fit*. He admits he wants 55 days; and that he cannot make them out for want of not being "*informed by any historian* exactly how many days elapsed between the time Athenæus stopped the daily sacrifices and the 25th of the month Casleu, when Jupiter was worshipped in the temple." But Mr. D. supplies this defect *in history*, by a "*guess*;" for he adds, "*Had* we been thus informed, [☞] *I have no doubt*, [☜] that we should find that time to be [☞] *exactly* [☜] *fifty-five days*." "*If* and *if*;" that is a fatal affair for Mr. D; the naughty *historian* should have been more particular. But, seriously, Mr. D. admits two facts that prove *fatal* to his argument. 1st. That he has *no history* to warrant his application of the days to Antiochus; and 2d, that his argument is spoiled, unless he can be allowed to supply the defect by *his* "*no doubt*," i. e., his "*guess*."

The fact is, the "little horn," and 2300 days, never have been, and never can be made to agree with the history of Antiochus. The attempt may delude the uninformed, but cannot endure the light. I will here oppose *a great name* to *great names*. As my words, who am but an obscure individual, will not weigh much against such men as Prof. Stuart, &c., I will introduce Sir Isaac Newton. On Dan. viii. 9—12, 23—25, he says—

"A horn of a beast is never taken for a single person: it always signifies a *new* kingdom; and the kingdom of Antiochus was an *old* one. Antiochus reigned over one of the *four* horns; and the little horn was a *fifth*, under its proper kings. This horn was at first a little one, and waxed exceeding great; but so did NOT Antiochus. His kingdom, on the contrary, was weak, and tributary to the Romans; and he did NOT enlarge it. The horn was 'a king of fierce countenance, and destroyed wonderfully, and prospered and practised:' but Antiochus was frightened out of Egypt by a mere message of the Romans, and afterwards routed and baffled by the Jews. The horn was mighty by ano-

Digitized by Google

ther's power; Antiochus acted by his own. The horn cast down the sanctuary to the ground, and so did NOT Antiochus; he left it standing. The sanctuary and host were trampled under foot 2300 days, (verse 14) and in Daniel's prophecies days are put for years; but the profanation of the temple, in the reign of Antiochus, did NOT last so many natural days. These were to last to 'the end of the indignation' against the Jews; and this indignation is NOT YET at an end.—They were to last till the sanctuary which has been *cast down* should be cleansed; and the sanctuary is NOT YET cleansed."

5. Another fact fatal to the application of the 2300 days to Antiochus, is, that Daniel was to stand in his "lot" at the end of the days, i. e., at the end of the 1335 days, chap. xii. 12, 13, which are admitted to be a part of the 2300. Did Daniel stand in his *lot* at the death of Antiochus, 164 years B. C.? That is, did Daniel rise from the dead then? For that, and nothing less, I conceive to be the meaning of the expression.

But one other consideration, it seems to me, must settle this whole question, that the polluting the temple by Antiochus was not intended by *placing* "the abomination that maketh desolate." Our Saviour, Matt. xxiv. 15, speaks of that abomination as something still future, 200 years after Antiochus was dead. He says, "When *ye* therefore shall *see* the *abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet*, stand in the holy place." Now, unless it can be proved that Antiochus' desolations were *after* Christ, instead of 200 years *before*, the attempt of our opponents, to make Antiochus the *scape-goat*, to bear away all the sins of Papal Rome, and their *modern* apologists, will be vain.

The Junior Editor of the "Midnight Cry," in the 24th number of that paper, thus notices the *absurdity* of applying the little horn to Antiochus:

"*First Absurdity.*—The four dynasties, dominions, or sovereignties, which succeeded Alexander's dominion,—of Grecia,—are represented each by its ap-

Digitized by Google

propriate horn, one for Egypt, one for Syria, one for Macedonia, and one for Thrace and Bythinia. Now, Antiochus Epiphanes was but *one* of *twenty-five* individuals, who constituted the Syrian horn. Could he, at the *same* time, be *another* remarkable horn?

"Let us give the degrees of comparison, according to the angel's *rules*, and thus compare truth with error. How easy and natural is the following gradation:

Great.	Very Great.	Exceeding Great.
PERSIA,	GREECE,	ROME.

"How absurd and ludicrous is the following!

Great.	Very Great.	Exceeding Great.
PERSIA,	GREECE,	ANTIOCHUS.

"*Third Absurdity.*—The Medo-Persian power is simply called 'GREAT,' (verse 4.) This power, the Bible tells us, 'reigned from India to Ethiopia, over a hundred and seven and twenty provinces.' This was succeeded by the Grecian power, which is called 'VERY GREAT,' (verse 8.) Then comes the power in question, which is '**EXCEEDING GREAT.**' Was Antiochus *exceedingly* (or *abundantly*) great, when compared with the conqueror of the world? Let an item from the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge answer: 'Finding his resources exhausted, he resolved to go into Persia, to levy tributes, and to collect LARGE SUMS, which he had AGREED TO PAY TO THE ROMANS.' Surely, we need not question, which power was exceeding great, that which exacted tribute, or that which was COMPELLED to pay it.

"*Fourth Absurdity.*—The power in question was 'little' at first, but it waxed or grew 'exceeding great, toward the SOUTH, and toward the EAST, and toward the pleasant land.' What can this describe but the conquering marches of a mighty power? Rome was almost directly northwest from Jerusalem, and its conquests in Asia and Africa were of course towards

Digitized by Google

the east and south: but where were Antiochus' conquests? He came into possession of a kingdom already established, and Sir Isaac Newton says, 'He did NOT enlarge it.' He did not fulfil this prophecy, and therefore *was not* the object predicted in it. Rome did fulfil it, and therefore is the object predicted. Rollin says, 'He assumed the title of Epiphanes, that is, illustrious, which title was *never* WORSE applied. The whole series of his life will show that he deserved much more that of Epimanes, (*mad* or *furious*,) which some people gave him.' Rollin then records a catalogue of his foolish actions, to show 'how justly the epithet *vile* is bestowed upon him;' then gives a detailed account of his life, and records the success he met with in attempting to take the city of Elymais, and plunder the temple of Diana. It seems that Antiochus had grown so weak, (instead of waxing exceeding great,) that the people, who had formerly paid tribute, were not afraid to withhold it. When he came against them, they 'took up arms to defend their temple, and gave him a *shameful* REPULSE.'

"*Fifth Absurdity.*—The crowning absurdity of all is, to suppose that Rome is *left out* of a vision which extends to 'the LAST end of the indignation.' Daniel had a view through the dark clouds which conceal the wonderful landscape of futurity from uninspired eyes. His vision is expressly directed to the things which shall befall his people in the LATTER DAYS. His eye pierces even to the resurrection of the dead, and the glorious kingdom beyond it. Now what are some of the objects in this wondrous prospect? The great object is his Saviour on the cross, dying under a Roman governor, and pierced by a Roman spear. Will he not see this object, on which all heaven gazes?

"There the 'latter days' commence. Daniel's people, after that, are still Abraham's seed, Christ's true Israel, and will he see *nothing* relating to them? Will he not see that 'exceeding great' power, under which the Jews 'fell by the edge of the sword, and

Digitized by Google

were led away captive into all nations,'—under which Jerusalem was desolated, and the temple burned,—under which 3,000,000 of Christians were killed, crucified, burnt, tortured, torn, or devoured, while it denied Christ,—and under which FIFTY MILLIONS have fallen, 'by flame, sword, captivity, and spoil,' during 'many days' since?"

III. The way is now prepared to inquire, *distinctly*, what power is represented by the little horn? Can there be any doubt of its being Rome?—Rome *Pagan* and *Papal?* Let us first look at *its origin*, verse 9; and let us remember, that in the Old Testament, nations are not brought into *prophecy* till somehow connected with the people of God. Rome had been in existence years before it is noticed in prophecy; and Rome had made Macedonia, one of the four horns of the Grecian goat, a part of herself 168 years B. C.; so that Rome could as truly be said to be "out of one of them," as the *ten horns* of the fourth beast, in the 7th chapter, could be said to come *out* of *that* beast, when they were ten kingdoms set up by the conquerors of Rome.

Having noticed the origin of the little horn, let us now inquire for the *time* it comes up.

23d verse: "When the transgressors are come to the full." It is clear that God designed that his people should trust in him alone;—hence he prohibited their making any "league" with other nations. See Judges ii. 2: "Ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land," &c. The Jews broke covenant with God, and about the year 158, B. C., they entered into a *league* with the *Romans*. See 1 Mac. 8th and 9th chapters. See Dan. xi. 23. It was at this point the "king [kingdom] of fierce countenance should stand up;" i. e., come to rule, as *first* noticed in the prophecy, because now they are first connected with the people of God. This, it will be seen, is *after* Macedonia, one of the four horns, has become a part of Rome.

Let us now look at the *character and acts* of the

Digitized by Google

little horn. It is of "*fierce* countenance." See Deut. xxviii. 49, 50: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, *as swift* as the eagle flieth, a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of *fierce countenance*, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young."

All admit the nation here spoken of is the Roman. The "little horn" has "understanding" of "dark sentences." In the text just quoted, from Deut., we are told the Romans are "a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand." Dr. Clarke says, "The learning of Rome is proverbial." The "*power*" of the "little horn" was to be "*mighty*." How *unlike* Antiochus! How *like* Rome! The little horn was to wax "*exceeding great*." How ridiculous to apply this to Antiochus; but how appropriately applied to Rome, which added to herself all the four horns of the Grecian goat, and subdued many other provinces. It *stands up against* the *Prince of princes*. Our Lord was crucified under the reign of Rome. If it be said, "the Romans did not put the Saviour to death, but that it was done by a Jewish mob;" I reply, let the objector read Acts iv. 26, 27—"The kings of the earth *stood up*, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and *against* his Christ. For of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, with the *Gentiles*," &c., "were gathered together." This settles that point.

The "little horn" *cast down* some of the host and of the *stars to the ground*, &c., v. 10. Compare this with Rev. xii. 3, 4: "A great red dragon," &c., "and his tail drew the third part of the *stars of heaven* and did *cast them to the earth*." All admit that this dragon is Rome; but who can fail of seeing its perfect agreement with the little horn?

"*He shall destroy wonderfully*." Do any say, "*this* is applicable to Antiochus?" I reply: If Antiochus destroyed wonderfully, Rome, *pagan* and *papal*,

Digitized by Google

destroyed "SEVENTY AND SEVEN FOLD" more so. For, while Antiochus destroyed a few of the Jews, Rome has destroyed *millions* of them, and more than fifty millions of Christians besides. Rome truly has "destroyed wonderfully." *Mark* another fact:—"By *peace* shall" he "destroy many." Antiochus did no such thing: but *papal* Rome, under pretence of being the *vicegerent* of the Prince of Peace, did destroy millions. Thus the little horn is distinctly marked to be Rome, pagan and papal. Once more,—mark its *end*: "*broken without hand.*" How clear the reference to the stone that smites the image "cut out *without hands.*" Rome is not only designated by its *origin*, *time* of its standing up, *character and acts*, but by its *end*. "Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall *destroy* with the brightness of his coming," 2 Thess. ii. 8. "Broken without hand."

This construction makes the vision in truth *like* the first. The application of it to Antiochus *originated* with a Jew, who wished to magnify his own nation, and has been backed up by Papacy, to keep its own *prophetic portrait* out of sight; and Protestants have put on the "*Babylonish garment*," and wear it as though it was the *spotless robe* of salvation; for, if that *robe* fails them, the *end of the world is upon them* in an hour they think not.

Verses 13, 14. "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain *saint* which spake, How long *shall be* the vision *concerning* the daily *sacrifice*, and the trangression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

Let us now decide, if we can, what "sanctuary" it is that is to be "cleansed," or "*justified*," as the margin has it.

Several things are called a *sanctuary* in the Bible.

1. The *Lord*, Isa. viii. 14.

2. *Heaven*, Ps. cii. 19. Neither of these can be meant in the verses before us.

Digitized by Google

3. *Judah*, Ps. cxiv. 2. But Judah is utterly cut off. See Isa. lxv. 15: "The Lord God *shall* SLAY THEE, and call his servants by another name." *Literal* Judah, then, is not to be cleansed, but is *slain*.

4. The *Temple* is called a sanctuary, 1 Chron. xxii. 19. But that is *destroyed*, and hence cannot be cleansed.

5. The *Holy of Holies*, Lev. iv. 6. That also is destroyed; and besides, it is *superseded*. See Heb. ix. 1—12.

There are only two things more, in relation to God's people, that are called a sanctuary, in the Bible. The sanctuary to be cleansed, spoken of in this chapter, is the one "trodden under foot" with "the host." If the "Prince of the host," v. 11, is the Lord Jesus Christ, then, there can be no doubt, his true church is "*the host*." By whom, or what, was the host to be trodden under foot? Two desolating powers, called "the *daily* and the *transgression of* DESOLATION." The word "*sacrifice*" is not in the text, and has no warrant for its insertion, except the mere *opinion* of the translators. The whole period of these desolating abominations, as noticed in this vision, from the *Ram pushing*, (for there the vision commences,) is 2300 days; then was to *terminate* the treading under foot. In the detailed explanation of the vision, in chapters xi. and xii., we have the time from the taking away of the first of these abominations to the removing of the second, *viz.* 1290 days; Dan. xii. 11; then we are assured that 45 days more are to bring us to the "end of the days;" then Daniel was to have his resurrection. If the sanctuary means here, as some suppose, the *church*, then it is to be cleansed, or, as the margin has it, *justified*, at *the resurrection* of Daniel, with all the saints.

The church *is* sometimes called a sanctuary, or temple of God. See 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, and Eph. ii. 21, 22. If, then, by "sanctuary" the church is to be understood, what is meant by its being cleansed, or justified? To *justify*, signifies "*to absolve* or *declare*

Digitized by Google

one innocent." To justify an individual is to acquit him. The term is applied to the acquittal of a sinner through faith in Christ; but the *full* discharge from *all the consequences of sin* does not take place till the resurrection of the just. See Rom. iv. 25: "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our *justification.*" Compare this with 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18: "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished.*" See, also, Isa. xlv. 25: "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory:"—till then, the church groans, being burdened,—for that event she waits. See Rom. viii. 18—23: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time *are* not worthy to *be compared* with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now: and not only *they*, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*"

When will this justification of the church take place? See Phil. iii. 20, 21: "Our conversation is in heaven, *from whence* also *we look* for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall *change our vile body*, that it may be fashioned *like* unto his *glorious body*," &c. See, also, 1 John iii. 2: "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he *shall appear*, we shall be *like him*," &c.

We may expect the church to be completely, fully, and eternally justified from all the consequences of sin, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels. So that if the church is the sanc-

Digitized by Google

tuary to be cleansed, or justified, it is at the *end of this world*.

Let us now see if we can find any other sanctuary to be cleansed. The *earth* or *land* is called a sanctuary. See Ex. xv. 17: "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the *mountain of thine inheritance*, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in; in *the sanctuary*, O Lord, which thy hands have established." See, also, Psa. lxxviii. 54: "He brought them to the border of his *sanctuary*, even to this mountain which his right hand had *purchased*." Compare these with Eph. i. 14: "Which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the *redemption* of the *purchased* possession." See, also, Rom. iv. 13: "For the promise that he should be HEIR OF THE WORLD, was not to Abraham, or his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Thus, we see, the earth is the *inheritance*, the *sanctuary* of Christ and his saints. Has it been defiled? and does it need *cleansing?* See Isa. xxiv. 5: "The earth is *defiled* under the inhabitants thereof, because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinances, broken the everlasting covenant." God created the world to be a mountain of holiness: but the wicked have *corrupted* it, so that the Lord is to purify it by destroying "those who destroy [*corrupt*, as the margin reads] the earth." See Rev. xi. 18. The very ground is now under the *curse*, in consequence of sin. See Gen. iii. 17: "*Cursed is the ground for thy sake.*" This world has been trodden under foot by wicked men and *wicked governments* unto this day. See Dan. vii. 23: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth—which shall *devour* the *whole earth*, and shall TREAD IT DOWN and break it in pieces." Such is emphatically the character of all worldly governments; they are a usurpation of the territory of God, and have corrupted the earth.

How will the earth be cleansed? I answer—*By fire.* See 2 Pet. iii. 7: "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved

Digitized by Google

unto FIRE, *against the day of judgment* and perdition of ungodly men."

When will this earth be cleansed? We have already seen it is to be at the day of judgment; but before I give a direct answer to the question, I wish to call attention to the following texts: Titus ii. 13: "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Ps. l. 3: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a *fire* shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Also, Ps. xlvi. 6—9: "The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved: he uttered his voice, and *the earth melted*. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. Selah. Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations he hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot *in the fire*." See, also, Ps. xcvii. 3—5: "The fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about. His lightnings enlightened the world; the earth saw and trembled. *The hills melted* like wax at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth." See Nahum i. 5, 6: "The mountains quake at him, and the hills *melt*, and *the earth is burned* at his presence, yea, the world, and all that dwell therein. Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide his anger? his fury is poured out *like fire*, and the rocks are thrown down by him." See Matt. xiii. 40—43: "As therefore the tares are gathered and *burned in the fire*, so shall it be at the *end of this world*. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a *furnace of fire;* there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Lastly, see 2 Pet. iii. 10—13: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night: in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall *melt* with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that

Digitized by Google

are therein, shall be *burned up*. Seeing, then, that all these things shall be *dissolved*, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for, and hasting unto the coming of the *day of God*, wherein the heavens being *on fire* shall be *dissolved*, and the elements shall *melt* with fervent heat. Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Having now decided what the sanctuary is,—that it is to be cleansed at the end of this world; and that it is to be done by *fire*,—the way is now prepared to show when the END *of this world will come*.

We will now give you the 13th and 14th verses of the eighth chapter of Daniel, leaving out what our translators have supplied:—"Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain which spake, How long the vision, the daily and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand three hundred days: then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

The inquiry, "How long *the vision*," clearly related to the "Ram" and "Goat," as well as "little horn"—and, the 2300 days are given in answer to the question,—"How long *the vision?*"

It was the *meaning* of *the vision* Daniel sought—verse 15: "It came to pass, when I had seen the vision, and sought for the *meaning*," &c.

It was to make Daniel understand the vision Gabriel was sent—verse 16: "I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called and said, Gabriel, *make* this man to *understand the vision*."

It was to make Daniel understand the vision Gabriel *came*—verse 17: "So he came near where I stood, and said unto me, *Understand*, O son of man."

The first thing Gabriel would have Daniel understand, was, that the vision *was down to the end*,—verse 17: "At [or *unto*] the time of the *end* shall be the vision." He would have Daniel understand that the

Digitized by Google

end intended was the *last end of indignation*,"—verse 19: "Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the *last end of the indignation;*" and he would have Daniel know that, "at the *time appointed*, the end shall be."

The 2300 days is the only time appointed. That time cannot be applied to a particular agent or event, without violence to the whole subject.

Now, let us inquire what Daniel did understand, and what not. The angel explained everything to him respecting the Ram, He-Goat, and Little Horn. But Daniel tells us in the last verse, "I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it." What did not Daniel understand? There were, evidently, three things he did not understand: 1st. What "sanctuary" was intended in verse 13; 2d. He did not understand how to *reckon the days;* and, 3d. Where to commence his reckoning. As Gabriel is not to be charged with *disobedience* to the command to make Daniel understand the vision, and as he has not fulfilled that command in this chapter, we must look elsewhere to see if he ever did what he was directed to do, and what *he promised* Daniel he would do.

Let us now look into the 9th chapter. Daniel there informs us that he found out "by books, the number of years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem." We might here inquire, Why did not Daniel "find that out before?" It was written in the book, but he did not discover it till now. Our opponents seem to think it is a conclusive argument that we are wrong, because the time of the end of the world has not been found out before now. But is it any more marvellous than that Daniel did not learn that the captivity of the Jews in Babylon was to be seventy years, till those years were accomplished?

When Daniel discovered this fact, fifteen years had passed since the vision of the eighth chapter, and he

Digitized by Google

had all that time been in uncertainty about the points that were not explained to him in that vision. He now seems to catch at the thought, that it must be the "sanctuary" at Jerusalem, to which the vision related, and he at once commences praying accordingly. He, at the 17th verse, prays especially about the *sanctuary*. "Now, therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy *sanctuary* that is desolate, for the Lord's sake." Daniel's mind is evidently on the vision, and he seems to suppose he has got the clue to the sanctuary that is to be "*cleansed*;" but Gabriel comes flying "*swiftly*," to stop Daniel in the midst of his prayer. See verse 21: "Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation."

Gabriel, why *this haste?* Why, I see Daniel is wrong—he don't understand the matter—he thinks the vision related to the sanctuary at Jerusalem, and I must stop him, for he is going astray.

"Gabriel, whom I had *seen* in the *vision*," says Daniel. What vision? Where had Daniel seen Gabriel in vision? Evidently nowhere but in the vision of 2300 days. "Well," says Gabriel, "I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding—therefore *understand the matter*, and *consider the vision*."

How is it possible that anything can be plainer than that both Daniel and Gabriel have the vision in mind, that "none understood," at the close of the eighth chapter? "Now," says Gabriel, "understand the matter, as by your prayer I see you did not, and consider the vision—direct your attention to what I have now to say of it. Seventy weeks are determined [*cut off*, so the word signifies] upon thy people." "*Cut off from what?*" Surely not from indefinite space; but from some time *previously* given. What time had Daniel given him before? None, except the 2300 days. The natural inference, then, is that the 70

Digitized by Google

weeks were cut off from those days: there is nothing else to cut them off from. *For what* are they cut off? Several objects are specified; but one *especially, viz.*, "to *seal up* [or, as the word signifies, see Dan. vi. 17, *make sure*] *the vision.*" That is, to confirm and establish the vision: so that, as certain as 70 weeks are accomplished at the death of Messiah, so shall *all* the vision be accomplished in 2300 days. Now if these 70 weeks are weeks of years, so are *all* the 2300 days, years. Can the things to be accomplished in those 70 weeks, transpire in so many literal weeks, i. e., in *one year* and 18 weeks? Certainly not. Then they must be reckoned in some other way. How else can they be reckoned? Is there any Scripture rule for reckoning days for years? See Ezekiel iv. 4—6: "Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it: according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days, so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days; I have appointed thee each day for a year." Here, then, we have an example of *days* being put for *years*. The 70 weeks, then, may be reckoned a day for a year, or 490 years. "But," say some, "the expression is *seventy sevens*, and means seventy sevens of *years*, or 490 years." Thank the objector; for he only strengthens my argument; for they are *cut off* from the 2300, and as you cannot cut off 490 years from 2300 days, it establishes the fact that those 2300 days are *years*, and that that was what the angel intended to teach Daniel.

The next point on which the angel would inform Daniel, is, where to commence his reckoning. This he does at the 25th verse: "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Mes-

Digitized by Google

siah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate."

Here we observe, that the point of *beginning* is at the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, and the *termination* of the 70 weeks is at the *cutting off of Messiah:* the angel then briefly states, that "the people of the prince that shall come," i. e., the same power denoted by the "*exceeding great* horn," "shall destroy the city and the *sanctuary;*" thus giving Daniel to understand that so far from the sanctuary at Jerusalem being cleansed, it was to be *utterly destroyed.* The angel, also, runs down in his explanation to the "*consummation*" of the whole 2300 years.

Let us now inquire when the "commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" went *forth.* It is true, there were several decrees relating to that subject. It cannot be either of the first two; because, neither of them can be made to harmonize with the history of Christ's death. There is but one of the four decrees relating to this matter that can agree with the event; and the commencement of the vision is clearly at the height of the Persian empire, as Daniel sees the "last horn" of the ram at its highest point when the vision first presents itself to him, and the ram is "*pushing;*" also, in the detailed explanation that the angel gives Daniel in the eleventh chapter, second verse, he points directly to the king of Persia, who "by his strength through his riches" should "stir up all against the

Digitized by Google

realm of Grecia." The Persian empire was at its height under Artaxerxes. In that period, therefore, we should expect to find the decree referred to. Accordingly we find it, in Ezra vii. 21—26, given by Artaxerxes; and Ezra tells us, 8th chap. 31st verse, "Then we departed from the river Ahava, on the twelfth of the first month, to go unto Jerusalem." The Jews reckoned their year from the spring equinox; hence, the 12th of the first month would be the fore part of our April. This, according to the chronology of our Bibles, was in the year before the birth of Christ, by the common reckoning, 457. Now from **2300**, the whole length of the vision, take **457**

and **1843** remains.

But, for the sake of the argument, suppose we are mistaken in respect to the precise year in which the commandment went forth; all commentators, I believe, agree in the fact, that our Lord was crucified just 490 years from that period. This admission is necessary in any argument with a Jew in proof that Jesus is the promised Messiah, and hence all Christians have used it. Dr. Adam Clarke says, that 490 years, *to a day*, transpired from the going forth of the commandment to the time that our Lord hung upon the cross. Thus, then, we have settled, by common consent, that 490 years terminated at the cross. But it will be seen that these 490 years, or 70 weeks, are divided into *three* very unequal parts, as follows:

7	weeks; **7** times **7** are	**49** years.
62	weeks; **7** times **62** are	**434** years.
1	week; **7** times **1** are	**7** years.
70	weeks,	**490** years.

The 49 years were employed under Ezra and Nehemiah in restoring and building Jerusalem; then 434 years more to Messiah, making 69 weeks. The term Messiah, signifies "*anointed*." When was Jesus anointed? At his baptism, when the Holy Spirit

Digitized by Google

descended upon him, and the voice from heaven proclaimed, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Then when our Lord came preaching, Mark i. 15, he says, "the *time* is *fulfilled*." What *time?* Clearly, the 69 weeks: no other time had been given for his manifestation. *One* week more remains to be filled up before he is cut off; and the chronology of nearly all our Bibles shows that his ministry lasted *seven* years. Turn to your Polyglott Bibles, and you will see, Matt. ii. 1: "Now when Jesus was born" —the note, by the translators, in the margin, saying, "4th year before the account called *Anno Domini*." Then turn to the 27th chapter, and you will find 33 as the year of his crucifixion; making his ministry 7 years. You will also find by an examination of the other Evangelists, that the chronology of our Lord's baptism is the year 26, and his death 33. The 70 weeks, or 490 years, then, extend to the year of our Lord which we call 33; and it has been made certain, by astronomical calculations, that that was the year of our Lord's death.

Some tell us, "Messiah was cut off in the *midst of the week*." The text says no such thing. It simply says—"In the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." The first inquiry here is, what are we to understand by "*the midst?*" It does not necessarily mean, in the middle of a thing. Absalom was "in the midst of the oak;" 2 Sam. xviii. 15. David would praise God "in the midst of the congregation;" Psalm xxii. 22. "God is working salvation in the midst of the earth;" Psalm lxxiv. 12. God let "flesh fall in the midst of" the Israelites' "camp;" Psalm lxxviii. 28. Christ is to "rule in the midst of his enemies;" Psalm cx. 2. Some men lie "down in the midst of the sea;" Prov. xxiii. 34. "Thou, O Lord, art in the midst of us;" Jer. xiv. 9. Christ is "in the midst of" two or three who meet in his name; Matthew xviii. 20. Jesus "stood in the midst of" his disciples when they were gathered together, after his resurrection. All these expressions show, that the phrase "in the midst of," denotes no more than, some-

Digitized by Google

where *within* the thing spoken of. It may signify throughout the entire period, or place, spoken of. Thus, in the text under consideration, I understand it to signify that the Messiah was to cause the sacrifice and oblation of the Mosaic law to cease during the entire period of his ministry. That is—He never sent a soul to offer those offerings, under the law, as a *condition* of any benefit he bestowed upon them. It was simply—"According to thy *faith* be it unto thee." And this was the case through the entire period of his ministry. He showed, from the very commencement of his preaching, that the great principle of faith was now to take the place of the sacrifices offered under the law. There is but one instance of our Saviour sending any one to offer the sacrifices of the law; and that, not as a condition of healing, but as a "*testimony to the priests*" that he *was healed*.

Now, as we have settled the point that the 70 weeks, or 490 years, are *cut off* from the 2300, we have only to subtract, thus:

2300 years, the whole length of the vision.
490 years to the death of Christ, or the year 33.

1810 remain from the cross. 1810 years, *from* the year 33, will terminate in **1843**.

But some say "Our Lord was crucified in the year 29, and not 33." They argue this from the fact that he was born *four* years before the commencement of the vulgar, or common era of his birth. This, it is true, would alter the calculation, if it could not be demonstrated that our Lord was crucified in the year that we call 33. But this has been demonstrated by the best of all evidence, aside from revelation, *viz.*, by *astronomical calculations*. The crucifixion took place at a *passover* full moon, or the first full moon after the *spring equinox;* and it took place on Friday. On this point Ferguson, the astronomer, says:—"The dispute among chronologers about the year of Christ's death is limited to four or five years at most. I find by calculation the only passover full moon that fell on

Digitized by Google

a Friday for several years before or after the disputed year of the crucifixion, was on the 3d of April, in the 4746th year of the Julian period." The Julian period is a period used by astronomers. The year 1843 is the 6556th year of that period. Now

Subtract from **6556**, the *present* year of the Julian period, **4746**, the year of the crucifixion,

and we have **1810** remaining.

Thus it is demonstrated that the year 1843 is 1810 years from the crucifixion; and I have before shown, that only that number of years remain of the vision after the death of Christ; and as we have proved that his death occurred in the year we call 33, we have only to add thus—

33 the year of the crucifixion.
1810 since the crucifixion.
1843 "the *end of the vision.*"

But, says the objector, "our Lord, then, was in his 37th year at the crucifixion, and that will make an alteration in the calculation." It is admitted he was in his 37th year: and this is proved by astronomical calculation also, and is as follows: Josephus, in giving a history of the last sickness of Herod, who commanded the children to be slain at our Lord's birth, records an eclipse of the moon to have taken place during that sickness. From Christ's death to that eclipse is 36 years. One year more added for the age of our Lord, at that time, would make him in his 37th year at his death. He was baptized and commenced his public ministry at 30. See Luke iii. 33. His age at his death cannot alter the calculation, so long as it is demonstrated that he was actually put to death in our year 33. The CROSS is the SEAL *of the vision*, and not the birth. Let me illustrate this point. Here is a *rail-road* 2300 miles long.

Here is the great depot, from which to start. + 1810 miles, the remainder.
490 miles to an inter | mediate depot.

Digitized by Google

We have travelled over 490 miles of this road to the intermediate depot; then a dispute arises in reference to a passenger who took his seat in the car some distance back. One says, he took his seat 29 miles back—no, says another, it was 33—not so, cries a third, he got into the cars 37 miles back. Now, I ask, can it make the distance one mile longer or shorter, from the starting depot to the intermediate one, whether the passenger took his seat 29, 33, 37 or 50 miles back? It is just 490 between the two depots, let the passenger take his seat at what point he would.

So, let our Lord's age be what it might, so long as it is settled that he died in our year 33, and that that terminated the 70 weeks, or 490 years, it cannot at all alter the calculation with regard to the termination of the vision.

Let me illustrate the subject before us. You are travelling a road with which you are unacquainted: night overtakes you: you inquire of a stranger, who tells you the road is a dangerous one, and you must not travel it in the dark: you tell him you must proceed; but, says the stranger, you will have to pass a river, the banks of which are perpendicular, and there is only a narrow bridge to pass that river—a single misstep will plunge you in irrecoverable ruin. You ask, how far it is to that river. He tells you, it is 2300 rods. You desire to know how you can determine the stranger has told you the truth. He informs you that just 490 rods from his door you will come to a high pillar, on the top of which is a *flaming torch* that can be seen at a great distance. You now take a measuring line and go forward, measuring as you go,—you see the torch, and find, on measuring to the foot of the pillar, it is just 490 rods. What now? Why, you reason thus—I find the stranger has told the truth thus far. What is the inference? Why, I shall find all he has told me is true. How far did he tell me it was to the river? 2300 rods. How far to this pillar? 490. How much farther then have I to go, to arrive at the river?

Digitized by Google

From 2300
Take 490

1810 left. You proceed, measuring as you go. I ask you if when you have measured off 1809 rods, you would not walk *carefully* the next rod, feeling every inch? Undoubtedly you would; and if you did not take heed you would be likely to perish.

Thus God has measured off 2300 years: that we might know that he had told us the truth, he gave us the *death* of Christ to seal, or *make sure* the vision, just 490 years from the commencement of the long period. Then the sum stands thus—As 490 years reach exactly to the Cross of Christ, so 1810 more will reach to the end of the vision.

We came to the cross, and found it just 490 years; we have passed that cross, and are closing up the last weeks of the 1810th year since that period. Ought we not to walk carefully—we stand on the verge of the termination of a period of solemn importance.

This year the vision of 2300 years will end: every hour, now, we are to look for the revelation of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven. *This year*, Daniel will stand in his "lot," or have his "*inheritance*," and all the saints with him. *This year*, the elements will melt with fervent heat, and the earth also: and the works that are therein shall be burned up. *This year*, "the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Prov. ii. 22. *This year*—"the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" will come. 2 Pet. iii. 7.

Are we ready for the solemn, the tremendous events? Have we repented of and forsaken our sins? Have we fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us, in Jesus Christ? Have we made our Judge our friend?—Not a moment is to be lost. When once the Lord Jesus has left his Mediatorial seat, the door of mercy is closed, and *closed* FOREVER!

Digitized by Google

The Return of the Jews.

BY GEO. STORRS.

It is said, "The world cannot come to an end yet, for the Jews are to be brought in first:" it is added, "God must have some great design in having kept the Jews a distinct people for the last 1800 years;" and, it is asked, "What can that design be but their conversion to Christianity?"

In reply, I remark, *God* has *not* "kept the Jews a distinct people." Here is the *root* of the error of our opponents, in regard to the Jews. I will not deny but that they are a distinct people; but, the question is, *who* has kept them so? Our opponents say *God* has; but I *deny it*. God has no more kept the Jews a distinct people than he has kept *drunkards* "a distinct people," or than he has kept Mormons, or Mahomedans, or Papists, or liars, or any other class of wicked or deluded men, "a distinct people." The fact is, God broke down the "*partition wall*" between Jews and Gentiles by the death of his Son; and never intended that any *distinction* should exist after "the seed should come to whom the promise was made." That "seed is Christ." See Gal. chap. iii. Christ, says Paul to the Ephesians, (ii. 14,) "is our peace, who hath made *both one*, [Jews and Gentiles] and hath *broken down the middle wall of partition*."

To talk about *God's keeping* "the Jews a *distinct* people," in the face of such positive declarations of the Bible to the contrary, it seems to me, shows a strong disposition to maintain *a theory* at all hazards. The truth is, God has abolished all distinction, under the gospel dispensation, between Jews, as the natural descendants of Abraham, and Gentiles. That very circumstance was what enraged the proud Jews, and they united in rebellion against God's purpose, and blasphemously said they would not be put on a *level* with

Digitized by Google

the Gentiles; and they have labored for 1800 years to keep up a "wall" of distinction, which, in the purpose of God, was to exist no more after his Son broke it down by his death upon the cross.

The Jews, then, have kept themselves "a distinct people," and have done it in *opposition* to the will of God unto this day, as *really* and as *criminally* as drunkards have kept *themselves* "a distinct people;" and it may just as well be claimed that God has kept the drunkards a distinct people with the design to convert *them*, as to set up such a claim for the Jews. I repeat it, the Jews are a distinct people by their *own fault*, and as *criminally* as drunkards, or any *other class of sinners*.

I shall now call attention to a few texts of Scripture which show that the *natural* descendants of Abraham, under the gospel, have no *peculiar* privileges or promises. See Matt. iii. 9: "And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Thus John the Baptist lays the "axe unto the root of the trees" of Jewish *prejudice* and *pride*, and gives them to understand that a dispensation is now opening in which the being a literal descendant of Abraham would avail nothing. This was a dreadful blow to *Judaism*, and it made the "*dry tree*" shake to its very roots. Now let us see if our Saviour did not cut it entirely down. See John viii. 39: "They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, IF *ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.*" Here is a plain, positive denial that the Jews, *as such*, were the children of Abraham; and a clear statement of what constitutes a real child of Abraham, viz., *doing* "the works of Abraham." Our Lord tells the Jews in the 44th verse, "Ye are of your father the devil." This gives us a clue to the inquiry, *who* has kept them a distinct people? It is their father, *the devil*. Let none attribute such a *devilish work* to God any more. They are a "distinct people" because they choose to obey the

Digitized by Google

devil rather than God; and to suppose that their conversion is to be the result of their serving devils is to suppose that God gives to men a reward for rebellion. Besides, whenever a Jew is converted, his distinctive character as a Jew ceases at once. This shows that their being a distinct people is a work of the devil and not of God, as God abolishes that distinction when they obey him. Now let us look at Rev. ii. 9: "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are of the synagogue of Satan." Again, Rev. iii. 9: "Them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie." Can any doubt who are meant by *real Jews* in these verses? Are they not real Christians? While the natural descendants of Abraham, as such, or Christians, who are so only in pretence, "are of the synagogue of Satan." In connection with these texts, see Rom. ii. 28, 29: "For he is NOT a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

Here inspiration settles the question, that those whom we *call Jews* are *not* Jews; and God no more regards them as Jews than he regards drunkards as sober men; or, than he regards wicked *apostates* as real Christians. We are here also given to understand distinctly, who are Jews under the gospel dispensation —they are *real Christians*.

That the literal descendants of Abraham, as such, are utterly rejected, except on the same conditions of other sinners, see Isa. lxv. 11—15: "But ye are they that forsake the Lord, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish the drink-offering unto that number. Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold,

Digitized by Google

my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen, for the Lord God shall SLAY THEE, and call his servants by another name."

What language could more forcibly express an utter rejection from the very *name* of being God's people than that here employed? Read over these verses again, and see how carefully and clearly God distinguishes between the Jews, as such, and *his people.* That this rejection of them from being his people was to last till the *end of this world*, see the following verses, where we are carried down to the new heavens and the new earth; and then God tells his people, whom he shall call "by another name," "Be ye glad and rejoice *for ever* in that which I create: for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." *What Jerusalem?* See Rev. xxi. 1, 2. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."

Here is a perfect parallel, and when compared together, give us a clear idea of the language of God by Isaiah, in the verses under consideration. The Lord adds, 19th verse, "And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying." This exactly corresponds with Rev. xxi. 4: "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away."*

Now see Rom. ix. 6—8: "Not as though the

* See my exposition of 65th chapter of Isaiah, page 77.

Digitized by Google

word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Compare this with Gal. iv. 28: "Now *we*, brethren, [*We. Who? Believers*—whether from among the Jews or Gentiles] *as Isaac was*, are the children of promise."

Here the apostle settles the question who are children of promise; and settles it to be those who have *faith in Christ*, without regard to their previous nationality. These are the persons to whom the promises are made, and not the natural descendants of Abraham.

What has become of old Jerusalem and her children? The apostle tells you in the 25th verse of this chapter —"For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." Is this old bond-woman and her children to inherit the promises of God with real Christians? See 30 and 31st verses of this chapter—"Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free."

But where is the Jerusalem to which the *promises are made?* See 25th verse: "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

Thus we learn, that old Jerusalem, or the Jews, *as such*, are rejected from the promises of God; and that all the promises pass over to the "servants" of God, who are called "by another name," *viz.*, to true Christians, who are the only true Jews and children of Jerusalem; so that there are no promises of restoration, or conversion, to the literal descendants of Abraham, more than to any other class of sinners.

"But," says the objector, "the Jews must be

Digitized by Google

brought in with the fulness of the Gentiles;" and he adds—"*that's Bible language.*" Thus spake a Doctor of Divinity of this city. Well, Doctor, where in the Bible do you find such language? Please tell us. *Ans. Nowhere! It's not there!* It's only in the Doctor's *Creed!* That's all! But is there nothing that sounds like it in the Bible? Perhaps there is; but when D. D.'s tell us such words are "Bible language," they should be careful that they quote correctly. The portion of Scripture, doubtless, referred to, is Rom. xi. 25: "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits,) that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in."

Now if this verse proves the return or conversion of the Jews, it proves also that it will not take place "UNTIL *the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.*" Of course, there is to be no more of the Gentiles converted after the bringing in of the Jews commences; and as I understand the aforesaid Doctor thinks the return of the Jews is to commence *this* year, his doctrine is as fatal to the Gentiles as ours. Let all then who are not Jews, be aroused to seek salvation immediately. *This year*, remember, "our enemies themselves being judges," probation is to cease to the Gentiles.

As the strength of the whole argument, so far as the New Testament is concerned, lies in the 11th chapter of Romans, I will give that chapter a full examination.

First. Who was the apostle addressing in that chapter? The 13th verse will tell you: "For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office." What was his controversy with the Gentile converts? It is evidently about the nature of that rejection, of which the Jews were the subjects. It seems, the Gentiles had imbibed the notion that God had utterly rejected the Jews, so that they were placed beyond the reach of salvation. Paul undertakes to refute that idea. How

Digitized by Google

does he do it? Let us begin the chapter. "I say then, hath God cast away his people? [That is—has he so rejected them that there is no salvation for them?] God forbid." But, how do you prove that, Paul? "I will tell you," says the apostle. *First*—"For *I* also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin," and *I* have obtained salvation. This is my first proof that God has not cast away the Jews *so* but that they *may* have salvation. But, Paul, you are a favored character—have you any other proof that God has not put the Jews beyond the reach of his mercy? Yes, says the apostle—"God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." The apostle adds—"Even so then, *at this present time*, also, there is a REMNANT according to the election of grace; this is my *second* argument that salvation to the Jews *is possible*, wicked as they are; *I* am saved, and a *remnant* besides are saved." Paul then proceeds to say—"And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work. What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the *election* hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded, (according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, ears that they should not hear;) unto this day."

Who were the "*election?*" *Ans.* Paul, and that part of the Jews who embraced the gospel: because they "were *obedient to the faith*," (see Acts vi. 7,) the Lord elected, or chose them to the enjoyment of his favor, as his spiritual Israel. Those who did *not obey* [see chap. x. 16 and 21st verses,] "were blinded." The apostle then goes on to say, verses 9 and 10, that David

Digitized by Google

prophesied of this thing—"And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling block, and a recompense unto them: let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow their back always."

Why were their eyes darkened? Because they *rejected* "*the true light*,"—the Lord Jesus Christ. But the apostle adds, 11th verse, "I say, then, Have they stumbled that they should fall," beyond the possibility of salvation? "God forbid;" or *by no means*, as the phrase signifies; "but through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy:"—*that is*, the Jews were provoked to jealousy by the salvation of the gospel being preached to the Gentiles. See Acts xiii. 45, 46: "But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."

The *middle wall* was now broken down—the Jews fell from the *peculiarity* they had enjoyed, and through, or by means of that fall, salvation came to the Gentiles on the same terms that it flowed to a Jew; *viz.*, by faith in Jesus Christ. "Now," says the apostle, 12th verse, "if the fall of them be the riches of the world," [or be the *means* of enriching the world, by salvation flowing to all men with equal freedom,] and the diminishing of them [or, as the margin reads, "*loss*" of them, or *their* "*loss*,"] the riches of the Gentiles, [or, has been the means *of* riches to the Gentiles,] "how much more their fulness." As though the apostle had said, "Salvation has richly flowed to you Gentiles through the loss to the Jews of their peculiarity, but if they could be induced, generally, to embrace the gospel, there would be a still greater blessing flow to the world." And surely the unbelief of the Jews has prevented thousands and millions, probably, from embracing Christianity; and what a work of enriching

Digitized by Google

the world they might have accomplished had they espoused the cause of Christ, instead of employing all their influence against it!

The apostle now proceeds to say, verses 13 and 14: "I speak to you Gentiles; inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office; IF BY ANY MEANS I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save SOME OF THEM."

Surely this language does not look much as if the apostle thought that the Jews were *all* to be converted. He even expresses a *doubt* as to the salvation of any of them; but says, he labors, "*if by any means*" he "might save *some of them*." He must have been peculiarly unfortunate in his expressions, if he intended to teach that the Jews were *certainly* to be converted. But, says the apostle, verse 15, "If the casting away of them [*viz.*, the *unbelieving* Jews] be the reconciling of the world, [i. e., the cause of the gospel of reconciliation being preached to the world; or, perhaps, more strictly, the means of destroying the cause of enmity between Jews and Gentiles, bringing all on to the same ground in relation to God and one another, thus destroying '*the enmity*' which had existed, '*by his cross*,' see Eph. ii. 15—18,—if this casting away of them resulted so gloriously for the world,] what shall the receiving of them be ['if by any means I might save some of them'] but life from the dead?" That is, if the Jews could "*by any means*" be brought to give up their unbelief, and embrace Christianity, it would give new life and power to the gospel itself. But Paul is very far from teaching that they should actually do so. All the apostle's language shows a *doubt* about the Jews, many of them, ever embracing the religion of Jesus. But he says, verse 16th, "If the first fruit be holy, the lump also" [may be holy.] Is not that the sense? The verb "*is*," is not in the original. What is the apostle's argument? Is it not this? "Though I have my doubts whether many of the Jews will be saved, yet their salvation *is possible*;

Digitized by Google

for if the *first fruit* [*viz.*, the apostle himself, and the *remnant* of whom he had spoken in the 5th verse] be holy, [or have been made holy] the lump [or body of the Jews *may be* made holy] also: and if the root [Christ, see Isa. xi. 10,] be holy, so are the branches." That is—if those who are now unbelieving, would believe on Christ, the root, they would become holy, as well as we who are the "first fruits," and so they might be saved. The whole argument goes to prove the *possibility* of the salvation of the Jews; but, at the same time, shows that the apostle had doubts whether many of them would be saved, though he hoped to "save *some of them*."

He now proceeds to caution the Gentile converts against being *puffed up* because they had been brought into exalted privileges: and he does this with tremendous effect, in verses 17—22. He says, "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say, then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God; on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."

The apostle then goes on to say, verse 23, "They also, IF *they abide not still in unbelief*, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again," IF they abide not still in unbelief. Here the apostle carefully sets his *sentinel*. It is a small word, it is true, but it is of tremendous import, showing that the apostle never designed to be understood as teaching the *certainty* of the Jews' *conversion:* if he had intended to teach it, he would not have set the unbending word

Digitized by Google

"*if*" to stand *sentinel* to keep all carnal Jews and Gentiles out of the church of God.

The apostle now proceeds to argue this case still further, and says, verse 24, "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive tree?"—"*if* they abide not still in unbelief." He then goes on to say, 25th verse, "For I would not have you to be ignorant of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part is happened to Israel, [or to *a part* of Israel, *viz.*, those who *bclieved not*, and this blindness will continue] until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in;" that is, till *the end of the world;* for, till then, we have no reason to suppose the fulness of the Gentiles will be come in. The apostle saw that a part of the Jews would continue to reject Christ till the end of the world; but that was no evidence of the impossibility of their salvation, "*if*" they would give up their "unbelief." Paul then adds, verse 26, "And so all Israel shall be saved—['*if* they abide *not still in unbelief;*'—for, the apostle speaks constantly in reference to the trusty *sentinel* he has set to guard against intruders] as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

Where is this written? See Isa. lix. 20, 21:

"And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; my spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever."

Here the prophet helps us to understand the apostle; and he teaches us that the promise is that the Redeemer shall come unto them that *turn from trans-*

Digitized by Google

gression in Jacob; and that the *covenant* relates to an *eternal* inheritance, and not to a mere conversion of any class of wicked men.

The apostle next proceeds to say, verse 28, that, "As concerning the gospel, they [the *unbelieving* Jews] are enemies for your sakes, [or, on your account, i. e., they were enemies because the partition wall was broken down, and the Gentiles were admitted to the same favor of God as themselves, and on the same terms—see Acts xiii. 42—46;] but, as touching the election, [that is, the *believing* Jews—see verse 7,] *they* are beloved for the fathers' sakes." God has a special love to a believing Jew for the fathers' sake, on the principle that he "keepeth covenant and *mercy* with them that *love* him, to a *thousand generations*." See Deut. vii. 9. Thus, the Gentile converts were made to understand, that though God had rejected the unbelieving Jews from his favor, yet, when they believed, as they all might if they would, they were regarded with special favor for the fathers' sake; for, God had not forgotten the faith of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and his "gifts and calling" to the "fathers," he had never repented of, or changed his purpose of making them the chosen vessels through whom he would bless the world.

Now let us examine the ORIGINAL PROMISES made to the fathers. See Gen. xiii. 14, 15: "And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, *to thee* will I give it, and to thy seed forever."

Now see 17th chapter, 7th and 8th verses: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give *unto thee*, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting possession;* and I will be their God."

Digitized by Google

Now compare these promises with Acts vii. 4, 5: "Then came he out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran; and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed them into this land, wherein ye now dwell. And he gave him *none inheritance* in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he *promised* that he would give it *to him* for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child."

Now, if the promise to Abraham related to literal Canaan, then the promise of God utterly failed. But it did not relate to that; and Abraham never so understood it. In proof of this, see Heb. xi. 8—10: "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: *for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.*"

The apostle goes on to say, verses 13 to 16: "These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that *they seek a country.* And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned: but now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for *he hath prepared for them a city.*"

The apostle continues to discourse, and enumerates "David, Samuel and all the prophets," who dwelt in the literal Canaan, and yet he tells us, verses 39, 40: "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

If the promise related to the possession of literal

Digitized by Google

Canaan, they did receive it; but Paul declares they did *not* receive the promise; which shows that the promise related to a different inheritance; even an heavenly, or the *new earth;* for "the meek shall inherit *the earth*."

Let us now examine the original promises as made to Isaac and Jacob. See Gen. xxvi. 3, 4: "Sojourn in this land; and I will be with thee, and will bless thee: for unto thee and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries: and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father: and I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries: and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." See, also, Gen. xxviii. 13, 14: "And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

Now let us inquire, who "thy seed" is, to whom those promises are made. See Gal. iii. 16: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

"Thy seed," then, "is Christ." Did Christ ever possess a foot of old Canaan? No. He had "not where to lay his head;" so he testifies himself. The promise, then, was not fulfilled to Abraham, Isaac, nor our blessed Lord; and hence remains *to be* fulfilled.

Let us now see if we can determine *to what* the promise related, and who are the heirs of it. See Rom. iv. 13—16: "For the promise, that he should be the HEIR OF THE WORLD, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made

Digitized by Google

of none effect. Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to *all the seed:* not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the *father of us all.*"

Now we have found *what* the inheritance is—who the heirs are---and who the children are to whom the promises are made, *not* the *literal* descendants of Abraham, but all who are "*of faith.*" *The world* belongs to Christ and his people: they have been persecuted and destroyed out of the earth; but our Lord is coming to glorify his saints, and to destroy his and their enemies, and take possession of the inheritance, after purifying it by fire, and renewing it in glory.

But let us examine the subject still further as to who are the heirs, and to whom the promises belong. See Gal. iii. 6—9. "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness; know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the *children of Abraham.* And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. *So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.*"

Now see the 15th to 19th verse, same chapter:

"Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, That the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

Digitized by Google

See also 26th to 29th verse, same chapter: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. *And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*"

If this does not settle the question, as to whom the promises belong, it seems to me impossible to settle any question.

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, neither received nor *looked* for a temporal inheritance. They understood the promises in a higher sense. They will be "*brought in*," and all the *true* "seed" with them; but, it is into an *eternal* inheritance, in the "new heavens and new earth."

When God brought Israel into *literal* Canaan, he directed all the wicked inhabitants to be destroyed out of it; so when he is about to bring his *true* Israel into the promised inheritance, and give them "*the world*" for their "*everlasting possession*," he will destroy all the wicked out of the earth. See Prov. ii. 22: "But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it."

See, also, Malachi iv. 1—3: "For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet, in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts."

Look at Rev. xi. 15—18: "And the seventh angel sounded: and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall

Digitized by Google

reign forever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest *destroy them which destroy the earth.*"

In view of the fact that the heirs of the promises are Abraham's children *by faith*, and not by *natural descent*, read the following Scriptures: Isa. xxxiii. 15—17, 20—22: "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; he shall dwell on high; his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks: bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure. Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off. Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down: not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken. But there the glorious Lord will be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams; wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby. For the Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King; he will save us." Isa. xxxv. 3—6, 9, 10: "Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, be strong, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then

Digitized by Google

shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon: it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there; and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Isaiah lv. 12, 13: "For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree; and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." Isaiah lx. 18—22: "Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls salvation, and thy gates praise. The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy son shall no more go down; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself; for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended. Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified. A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation—I the Lord will hasten it in his time."

See also Ezekiel xxxiv. 23—28: "And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them: I the Lord have spoken it. And I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land—and they shall dwell safely in

Digitized by Google

the wilderness, and sleep in the woods. And I will make them and the places round about my hill a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in his seasons—there shall be showers of blessing. And the tree of the field shall yield her fruit, and the earth shall yield her increase, and they shall be safe in their land, and shall know that I am the Lord, when I have broken the bands of their yoke, and delivered them out of the hand of those that served themselves of them. And they shall no more be a prey to the heathen, neither shall the beasts of the land devour them; but they shall dwell safely, and none shall make them afraid."

Thus we have "given unto us *exceeding great* and *precious promises*." But take those promises and give them to *carnal* Jews, and you "take the children's bread and cast it unto dogs." Such is the work, I think, those are doing who apply such promises to any but Abraham's children *by faith:* to *them* "the promises are made," and to them *alone*. The *true* Israel shall all be gathered when Christ appears in the clouds of heaven—then "He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet; and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of the heaven to the other." Wherever they have been scattered, they shall now all be gathered; yea, into "*their own land*," and shall be "HEIRS OF THE WORLD;" then will "*the saints*" have taken "*the kingdom*," and they shall "possess the kingdom *forever*, even for EVER *and* EVER."

That glorious day is *now* "nigh, even at the doors." Let the children of God "lift up" their "heads, for" their "redemption" is at hand; now ready to be revealed. Let us wait, watch, and keep ready for that day.

In conclusion, I wish my readers to look at the following texts. 2 Cor. i. 19, 20: "For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, even by me, and Sylvanus and Timotheus, *was* not *yea* and nay, but in him was yea. For *all* the promises

Digitized by Google

of God in him are yea, and *in him* Amen, unto the glory of God by us." Compare this with 1 John v. 12: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life."

Can it be plainer, that ALL THE PROMISES of God are IN CHRIST! and therefore they are not to any soul OUT of him; whether *carnal* Jews or any other class of wicked men. May the Lord give us understanding in all things, and guide us unto his eternal kingdom.

Exposition of Isaiah LXV. 17—25.

BY GEORGE STORRS.

THERE are many who think this portion of Scripture relates to some regeneration in this world prior to the end, or a second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; or else that it is to be understood as *figurative*. I apprehend it is neither the one nor the other, but that it is a plain literal description of the final abode of the saints. The apostle Peter, after showing that the heavens and the earth which are now are to be dissolved, or melted, adds—"Nevertheless, we, *according to* HIS PROMISE, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Where did Peter find that *promise?* Let us now proceed to an examination of Isa. lxv.

Verse 17. "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind;" or, as the margin has it, "come upon the heart," or *be desired*. Such will be the glory of the *new* earth that there will be no desire for the *old* which has passed away."

Verse 18. "Be ye glad and rejoice *forever* in that which I create: for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." *What Jerusalem?* See Rev. xxi. 1, 2: "And I saw a new heaven and

Digitized by Google

a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."

Here is a perfect parallel, and when compared together, give us a clear idea of the language of God by Isaiah, in the verses under consideration. The Lord adds, 19th verse: "And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying." This exactly corresponds with Rev. xxi. 4: "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away."

But some will say, the 20th verse of the 65th chapter of Isaiah shows that it cannot be speaking of the immortal state. Let us see. "There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die a hundred years old; but the sinner being a hundred years old shall be accursed."

Now, what is the instruction intended to be communicated in this verse? Not that there is dying in that state, or in the new earth spoken of; for such an interpretation would contradict the 19th verse, which expressly says, "The voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying." Now, this cannot be true if there is death there. What then does the 20th verse mean? Let us examine it. There is to be new heavens and a new earth. The inhabitants are to *correspond* with such a regeneration; then there must be no more *helplessness*, for, this would produce both sorrow and crying, which are not to exist in that state. But, will not the helpless infants enter that world, who leave this in all their helplessness? Yes. But when they enter there they shall be as perfectly free from helplessness as though they had died a "hundred years old." "The child shall die a

Digitized by Google

hundred years old;" or, he shall at once attain to as great perfection as though he had been at that age when he left this world; and this is given as a *reason* why "there shall be no more thence an infant of days," or helpless infants there. They will be at once as capable of taking care of themselves as though they had left this world "a hundred years old." There shall not be there "an old man that hath not filled his days." As there shall be no sorrow from *infancy*, so there shall be none from *age;* for, old men who have "*filled*" their days, i. e., the *righteous* old men, shall have their "*youth renewed* like the eagle;" Ps. ciii. 5; while "the sinner an hundred years old shall be accursed;" that is, he shall not enter that *new earth at all;* for nothing that is cursed can come there.—This I believe to be the plain sense of this 20th verse. In this interpretation I am sustained by the reading and notes in some of the oldest Bibles. One copy, printed before 1580, reads thus: "There shall be no more there a child of years, nor an old man that hath not filled his years; for he that shall be an hundred years old shall die as a young man." A note in the margin says, "Meaning, in this wonderful restoration of the church, there shall be no weakness of youth nor infirmities of age, but all shall be fresh and flourishing: and this is accomplished in the heavenly Jerusalem when all sins shall cease and the tears shall be wiped away." On the last clause of the verse, "the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed," the same note says, "Whereby he showed that the infidels and unrepentant sinners have no part of this benediction."

"But," continues the objector, "it cannot refer to the immortal state, for the 21st verse says—They shall *build houses* and inhabit them. Surely nothing of that can take place in heaven."

Where is heaven? Most people suppose that heaven is somewhere in indefinite space, but seem to have no definite idea *what* it is, nor *where* it is. Of course, their faith has no object to rest upon; the result is, they have become reconciled to make the best

Digitized by Google

of this world, and are striving to make themselves so comfortable in their fine houses, pleasant walks, and worldly joys, that you cannot give them greater trouble than to tell them Christ is coming to put his saints into their inheritance: they are well satisfied to live *here* forever, without Christ, in preference to going to a heaven of which they have no definite idea.

But let us see what the Scriptures teach about the saints' inheritance. See the following texts. Psa. xxxvii. 9: "For evil doers shall be cut off: but those that wait upon the LORD, they shall *inherit the earth*." *Verse* 11: "But the meek shall *inherit the earth*; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." *Verse* 22: "For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be cut off." *Verse* 29: "The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever." *Verse* 34: "Wait on the LORD, and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land: when the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it." "*See*" *what?* See the *land* they are *to inherit*. *When?* "When the wicked are cut off;" according to Proverbs ii. 22: "But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Then "the upright shall dwell in *the land*, and the perfect shall *remain in it*." And our Saviour saith—"Blessed are the meek: for they shall *inherit the earth*."

Have these and similar promises ever been fulfilled to the saints? No; their portion has been and will be, "*in this world*, TRIBULATION." But the promise is, that they *shall inherit the earth*—be "HEIRS OF THE WORLD." See Rom. iv. 13.

The earth, then, renewed, regenerated by fire, and the power of God, is to be the eternal inheritance of the saints, and they shall "DWELL THEREIN FOREVER."

Having now settled the *place* of the saints' abode, we may attend to what Isaiah saith. "They shall build houses and inhabit them." "Will they build houses in the new earth?" So Isaiah saith: and shall

Digitized by Google

I dispute it? God says they will, and I dare not say, *nay*. See the description of the New Jerusalem, Rev. 21st chapter. Here are "*walls—gates*," &c. It looks very much like *building;* and I know of no right we have to make the language figurative. I agree with Isaiah, then; they will build houses and inhabit them. "Let God be true," if "every man" is proved a "liar."

But says the objector—"The prophet tells us 'They shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them.' Do you think they will *eat* there?" *Why not? Angels* eat. See Psa. lxxviii. 25: "Man did eat angels' food." Where? In the wilderness, when God gave them "manna," "the corn of heaven." See also Gen. xviii., where the "Lord" and "two angels" appeared to Abraham. What was done on that occasion? "And Abraham hastened into the tent unto Sarah, and said, Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead *it*, and make cakes upon the hearth. And Abraham ran unto the herd, and fetched a calf tender and good, and gave *it* unto a young man; and he hastened to dress it. And he took butter, and milk, and the calf which he had dressed, and set *it* before them: and he stood by them under the tree, and THEY DID EAT." Our Lord *ate* after his resurrection. See Acts x. 40, 41: "Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly: not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, *even* to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." Thus we see our Lord *eat*, and why may not his members *after their* resurrection?

Now look at the following texts. Luke xxii. 29: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me:" *Verse* 30: "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Rev. vii. 17: "For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." I might multiply this tes-

Digitized by Google

timony, but enough has been given to show what the Scriptures teach on the question; and that, in the immortal state, there is eating and drinking; not figuratively, but *really*.

"But that makes heaven very carnal!" I ask,—Does it make it any more carnal than the Bible makes it? I think not: and I dare not *alter* it.

Verse 22: "They shall not build and another inhabit;" [as men often do in this world;] "they shall not plant and another eat;" [i. e., they shall not have the fruit of their efforts wrested from them, as is frequently done in this state of sin and covetousness;] "for as the days of a tree" [even "the *tree of life* which is in the midst of the Paradise of God"] "are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands," [even "forever and ever."]

Verse 23: "They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth [the fruit of that labor] for trouble;" [because there is none to "hurt or destroy" in the new earth;] "for they are the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them." ["Behold, I and the children which thou hast given me." Such will, no doubt, be the language of many who have been instrumental in bringing their children into the new earth.]

Verse 24: "And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear."

This denotes the special and constant attention that God will give to their "*desires*," all of which will there "*be granted*;" and that without delay.

Verse 25: "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock; and dust *shall be* the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the LORD."

"That shows," says the objector, "that it cannot be in the immortal state, or new earth." But I ask—*Why not?* Can any man prove that there are to be no animals in that land? I think none can do it. When Adam was created there were animals on the

Digitized by Google

earth; and none, I apprehend, can show that those animals would ever have died, had it not been for the introduction of sin. The animal creation have suffered by the sin of man, and not by their own fault. God pronounced his work, at the close of creation, "*very good;*" and when the work of "*restitution*" is accomplished, let any man show, who can, that there are no animals in that regenerated state. It is true, their ferocious character will be changed, and will correspond with the *peaceable* character of the inhabitants of the new earth. Can any man believe the earth, itself, would ever have been "*cursed,*" [see Gen iii. 17,] had it not been for sin? The animals felt the shock, and "*the whole creation* groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now;" but when the "*times of restitution* of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy *prophets* since the world began," comes, then, let him show, who can, that animals will not be restored to that which they lost by no fault of their own. The new earth will be no more than "*very good;*" and when the earth *was very good* there were animals. See Gen i. 24, 25, 26: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beasts of the earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it *was* good. *And God saw everything he had made, and behold it was very good.* And the evening and the morning were the sixth day."

When "the redemption of the purchased possession" is fully accomplished, and God says "IT IS DONE," then shall all things which are not cursed by their own fault, again be *very good;* nor can I see any reason why animals, which were included in the approbation God gave to his works, are to be excluded from that regeneration.

This view presents to the mind a heaven, not of *imagination*, but of *reality:* a heaven such as the

Digitized by Google

ancient worthies looked for, and "took joyfully the spoiling" of their "goods, knowing" that they had "in heaven a better and an enduring SUBSTANCE."

Harmony of Zechariah XIV.

BY GEO. STORRS.

We will now attempt a harmony of Zechariah xivth. Let us remember that the prophets see different events at the same glance, in the prophetic glass, and often record the events without noting the chronological order. Apply this idea to the chapter under consideration, and read it as follows:

Verses 1—2: "Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city."

Verses 12—15: "And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite all the people that have fought against Jerusalem; their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth. And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great tumult from the Lord shall be among them; and they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbor, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbor. And Judah also shall fight at Jerusalem, and the wealth of all the heathen round about shall be gathered together, gold, and silver, and apparel in great abundance. And so shall be the plague of the horse, of the mule, of the camel, and of the ass, and of all the beasts that shall be in these tents, as this plague."

Digitized by Google

Verses 17—19: "And it shall be, that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem, to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain. And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, that have no rain; there shall be the plague, wherewith the Lord will smite the heathen that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles. This shall be the punishment of Egypt, and the punishment of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles."

Verses 3—11: "Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear nor dark: but it shall be one day which shall be known to the Lord, not day, nor night; but it shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light. And it shall be in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem: half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be. And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one. All the land shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem: and it shall be lifted up, and inhabited in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's wine-presses. And men shall dwell in it, and there shall

Digitized by Google

be no more utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited."

Verse 16: "And it shall come to pass that EVERY ONE *that is left* of all the nations which came against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles."

Verses 20—21: "In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD; and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts; and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein; and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts."

Harmony of Revelation 19th, 20th, 21st.

BY GEO. STORRS.

THERE are many who suppose it is impossible to understand the Book of Revelation. The reason of this mainly is, I apprehend, because they suppose that it must be interpreted in such a manner as to make the events transpire in the same order, or succession, as they find them written. In this way it is utterly impossible to give that book an interpretation. To understand the words of the prophets, we must, in our imagination, carry our minds back to the time when they lived. They look down through the prophetic glass and see future events passing before their eyes often without regard to the precise period or order in which they are to take place; and when they have seen these events they frequently record each topic, or subject of discourse, to its *termination*, before they take up another which transpired in the same period, or during some part of the same period, and was a

Digitized by Google

parallel event, though, in the record made of it, it follows after. By not observing this fact, we are constantly getting into confusion, in our attempts to explain the prophecies; and becoming bewildered, we give up in despair, and conclude none can understand them. The principle to which I have called attention, is overlooked, though it is a principle which we find acted upon by historians. For example, see Mosheim's Church History. He first divides the history into *periods* of a hundred years each. Then he takes up a topic—perhaps "*The prosperous events of a Church*" —he traces that topic to the close of that century; then in the following chapter he takes up another topic —perhaps "*The doctrine of the Church*," which he traces to the termination of the same period: thus each *succeeding* chapter takes up a new topic, and yet travels on through the *same century*. Now, if, in reading Mosheim, you were to suppose, when you came to the end of the first chapter, that the following one must begin a *new* century, or period, because it *follows* the first, which closed at the end of the period it treated of, you would commit just such an error as is committed in the usual attempts at explaining the prophecies, especially the book of Revelation. The fact is, in that book we are carried down to the *end* seven or eight times at least: and in the 20th, 21st, and 22d chapters several topics are introduced, *viz.*, *the resurrection—the judgment—the new earth—the new Jerusalem*, &c.; and yet all these topics belong to the same period, or thousand years, and are events presented to John's mind at one and the same time, though recorded as if they followed each other in succession. That the "*beloved city*" was on earth when Satan was loosed out of his prison, is clear from the 9th verse of the 20th chapter; and yet the descent of that city upon the earth is not *recorded* till the commencement of the following chapter.

I will now try to give what I conceive to be a *harmony* of the last part of the 19th chapter, with the 20th and the first part of the 21st. That the reader may

Digitized by Google

see the beauty and force of this part of the word of the Lord, I shall put down every word from the 11th verse of the 19th chapter to the eighth verse of the 21st chapter; paying no attention to the present division into chapters and verses, giving you the whole in paragraphs.

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns: and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath *on his* vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS. And I saw an angel standing in the sun: and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come, and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God: that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.

Digitized by Google

"And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season.

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them. And I saw *a great white throne*, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and heaven fled away; and there was no place found for them. And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.

"And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither had received his mark upon their forehead, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. This is the first resurrection: blessed and holy is he which hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the BOOK OF LIFE; and the dead were judged out of those things

Digitized by Google

which were written in the books, according to their works.

"But the *rest of the dead* lived not AGAIN until the thousand years *were finished;* and [then] the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them. And when the thousand years are expired Satan shall be loosed out of *his prison*, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea; and they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and *they* were judged, every man according to *their* works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire: this is the second death; and whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire; and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them: and the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.

"And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, *It is done.* I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all [these] things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have *their part* in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which [part] is the *second death.*"

This is what I conceive to be a harmony of this part of Revelation. In this view all is plain.

Digitized by Google

Exposition of Revelation XI.

BY GEO. STORRS.

THE TWO WITNESSES.

"AND there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple, leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty *and* two months."

"*The angel.*" *What angel?* Evidently the same that John had described in the tenth chapter. What angel was that? Read the first verse of that chapter. "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud: and a rainbow *was* upon his head, and his face *was* as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire." Compare this description with *first* chapter, 15th and 16th verses. "And his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace: and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword: and his countenance *was* as the sun shineth in his strength."

This person all admit to be the Lord Jesus Christ. Can there be any doubt as to the identity of the person in the first chapter and the angel in the tenth? It seems to me there can be none. This same angel commands John to "measure the temple of God," &c. By the temple of God, though a reference is had to the *literal* temple at Jerusalem, I understand the *church of God.* See Ephesians ii. 19—22: "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners,

Digitized by Google

but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner *stone;* in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together, for a habitation of God through the Spirit."

This temple was now to be measured. The idea of measuring is to take the dimensions of a thing. This must be done by some rule. The rule, by which to measure the church of God, is the word of God. In this measurement, therefore, that which does not comport with that rule will not come within the temple —it is to be left out—it is the "outer court." The courts of the temple, at Jerusalem, were three: the first, called the court of the Gentiles, because the Gentiles were allowed to enter so far and no farther: they were not *of* the Jews, though they came *to* the same temple. They were properly representatives of *nominal* professors of Christianity, as the Jews were of *real* Christians.

John is not to measure the *nominal* professors of religion, as they come not *within the true* church, and will be the greatest persecutors of that church—treading it "under foot" for a specified period. The phrase "holy city" is used by the Revelator to denote the true church, or its habitation. See chap. xxi. 2, and xxii. 19. The real church of God was to be trodden under foot, by these Gentiles, in a peculiar sense, "42 months." I have shown, in my exposition of Daniel 7th chap., that "42 months," in prophetic language, is 1260 years; and this treading under foot of the holy city exactly corresponds with the time given to the "little horn" that "made war with the saints." By the Gentiles, then, treading the holy city under foot, we can understand nothing else than the terrible havoc the papal church has made of the true church of God; which bloody work lasted from A. D. 538 to 1798, at

Digitized by Google

which the popes had carried on their war against dissenters for 1260 years, was abolished. Since that period, the true church has been free from the *civil* despotism of Papacy.

Verse 3: "And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth."

Here I would remark, *first*—The same period is occupied by the prophecy of these two witnesses in sackcloth, that the holy city is trodden under foot; and this appears to mark the periods as identical.

Let us now inquire—Whose witnesses are these? "*My* two witnesses," says the speaker. Who is the speaker? "The angel"—the Lord Jesus Christ, as I have already shown.

What is a witness? It is one who gives *testimony*. Testimony is *oral*—that is, a witness testifies to what he knows, by *word of mouth*—or it is *written*; this last kind of testimony, in some cases, is stronger than oral. For example: You may produce twenty persons, in court, to prove my indebtedness to you, but if I can produce a receipt, in your hand-writing, that I have paid the alleged debt, your twenty witnesses fall before it, and their entire testimony is outweighed by this *one* witness.

The witnesses spoken of in the verse under consideration, are Christ's. Let us then inquire who are his *two witnesses*. Observe, they are not two *of* his witnesses; but emphatically, "my TWO witnesses." It would not, therefore, be proper to call them *men*, though men are sometimes called the Lord's witnesses. Let us now look at John v. 31—34, 36—39: "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me, and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. But *I receive not testimony from man*; but these things I say that ye might be saved. But I have a greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same

Digitized by Google

works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. And ye have not his word abiding in you; for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. Search *the Scriptures*, for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which TESTIFY OF ME."

Do we not here find one of Christ's witnesses? namely, the Old Testament Scriptures. Let us now see if we can find the other. See Matt. xxiv. 14: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a WITNESS unto all nations."

Is not this the other witness of Christ? And if so, are not the *Old* and *New* Testaments the "*two* witnesses" in question? But again,

Verse 4: "These are the two olive-trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth."

Where do we find these *two* olive trees? See Zech. iv. 2—6: "And [the angel] said unto me, What seest thou? And I said, I have looked, and behold, a candlestick, all of gold, with a bowl upon the top of it, and his seven lamps thereon, and seven pipes to the seven lamps, which are upon the top thereof: and *two olive-trees* by it, one upon the right side of the bowl, and the other upon the left side thereof. So I answered and spake to the angel that talked with me, saying, What are these things, my lord? Then the angel that talked with me answered and said unto me, Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my lord. Then he answered and spake unto me, saying, THIS IS THE WORD OF THE LORD unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

Here, then, we are told that the two olive-trees are the word of the Lord. The Revelator says, "My two witnesses are the two olive-trees." Let us now look at 1 Kings vi. 23—28: "And within the oracle, he made two cherubims of *olive-tree*, each ten cubits

Digitized by Google

high. And five cubits was the one wing of the cherub, and five cubits the other wing of the cherub: from the uttermost part of the one wing unto the uttermost part of the other were ten cubits. And the other cherub was ten cubits: both the cherubims were of one measure and one size. The height of the one cherub was ten cubits, and so was it of the other cherub. And he set the cherubims within the inner house; and they stretched forth the wings of the cherubims, so that the wing of the one touched the one wall, and the wing of the other cherub touched the other wall; and their wings touched one another in the midst of the house. And he overlaid the cherubims with gold."

Compare this with Exodus xxxvii. 6—9: "And he made the mercy-seat of pure gold; two cubits and a half was the length thereof, and one cubit and a half the breadth thereof. And he made two cherubims of gold, beaten out of one piece made he them, on the two ends of the mercy-seat; one cherub on the end on this side, and another cherub on the other end on that side; out of the mercy-seat made he the cherubims on the two ends thereof. And the cherubims spread out their wings on high, and covered with their wings over the mercy-seat, with their faces one to another; even to the mercy-seat-ward were the faces of the cherubims."

It would seem, then, that the "two olive-trees" and the "two cherubims" were the same, and represent "the word of the Lord." Their position is worthy of notice. They stand one on each side of the "mercy-seat," looking *inwards* and *downwards* upon that seat. Does that mercy-seat represent Christ? So all Christians seem to admit. The cherubims, one on the left hand, with his outer wing touching the wall and his inner wing reaching to the mercy-seat while he is looking down upon that seat, denoting that the Old Testament begins at the beginning of the world, looking to Christ to come, and, extending to that period, is a witness for Christ, *testifying* of him:

Digitized by Google

the other cherub stands on the right side of the mercy-seat; its inner wing extending to the mercy-seat, and its outer wing reaching to the other wall, denoting that the New Testament begins at Christ, or the mercy-seat, and extends down to the everlasting kingdom of God, but is constantly looking to Christ. Thus the two cherubims are at perfect agreement, as indicated by their being of "one size and one measure." A beautiful harmony and agreement is found to exist throughout the Old and New Testaments; a beauty that can only be seen by a careful comparing of the one with the other. He, therefore, that rejects either, or exalts one above the other, breaks the harmony and introduces confusion into the testimony of Christ's two witnesses, and thereby "*hurts*" them. Let all who would be guided aright, examine these two witnesses together. There are too many who seem to think that the New Testament supersedes the Old: this is a most fatal error. Those who do this, act as foolishly as the mariner who should cast away his rudder because he has a compass.

But again; these two witnesses are "the two candlesticks standing before the God of the whole earth." For an account of the candlestick made by Moses see Exodus xxv. 31, and onward. Our Saviour saith, Matt. v. 15: "Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick: and it giveth light unto all that are in the house."

The Psalmist says, Ps. cxix. 130, "The entrance of *thy word* giveth light." Again, in the 105th verse, he says, "*Thy word* is a lamp [margin, *candle*] unto my feet," &c. It seems, then, that the candlestick is a representation of God's word. Zechariah sees *one*—the Old Testament; John has *two* brought to his consideration, viz., the *Old* and *New*.

Let us now look at the clothing of the two witnesses—"sackcloth" for "42 months."—Sackcloth indicates a state of mourning. See Isa. xxii. 12: "And in that day did the Lord God of hosts call to weeping, and to mourning, and to baldness, and to girding with sackcloth."

Digitized by Google

Did the two witnesses go into such a state? They did. About the year A. D. 538, the Greek and Latin languages ceased to be spoken in Italy. The Scriptures were written in those languages, and the Romish priesthood prohibited their translation for the use of the people. Thus the witnesses were hid from the common people, and their testimony was corrupted by the pretended interpreters. In other words, the two witnesses went into their "sackcloth" state.

Verse 5: "And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man hurt them, he must in this manner be killed."

Compare this with Jer. v. 14: "Wherefore, thus saith the Lord God of hosts, Because ye speak this word, behold, I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them." See Num. xvi. 35: "And there came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense." They "hurt" the word of the Lord by acting contrary to its requirements.—See Rev. xxii. 18, 19: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from those things which are written in this book." Men hurt the word of the Lord by *adding* to it or *taking from* it; and those that do so, knowingly, or from love to sin, or opposition to its requirements, will be "*killed*," or "*devoured*" by the word, or witnesses; or, according to their testimony.

Verse 6: "These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will."

Here is an evident allusion to Elijah, 1 Kings xvii. 1: "And Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the inhabi-

Digitized by Google

tants of Gilead, said unto Ahab, As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word;" and to Moses, Exodus vii. 19: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, Say unto Aaron, take thy rod and stretch out thy hand upon the waters of Egypt, upon their streams, upon their rivers, and upon all their pools of water, that they may become blood: and that there may be blood throughout all the land of Egypt, both in vessels of wood and in vessels of stone."

The judgments threatened by the mouth of these two witnesses will as certainly come upon individuals and nations, as drought and blood followed the words of Elijah and Moses. It will be vain, therefore, for any man or body of men to think to escape those judgments by a war on the truths of the Bible; for what the witnesses have spoken, will surely come to pass. The plagues written in God's word will be inflicted, let men scoff as they may.

Verses 7 and 8: "And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified."

"When they shall have *finished* their testimony" —that is, "in *sackcloth*;" or, as the original signifies, when they are "*finishing*," &c., just as they are coming to the termination of their sackcloth state. A "beast," in prophecy, denotes a kingdom or power. See Dan. 7th chap. 17th and 23d verses. The question now arises, when did the sackcloth state of the witnesses close? and did such a kingdom as described make war on them at the time spoken of? If we are correct in fixing upon A. D. 538 as the time of the commencement of the sackcloth state; 42 months, being 1260 prophetic days, or years, would bring us down to A. D. 1798. About this time, then, did such a kingdom as described appear and make war on

Digitized by Google

them? &c. Mark,—this beast, or kingdom, is out of the bottomless pit—no foundation—an atheistical power—"spiritually Egypt." See Ex. v. 2: "And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go."

Here is atheism. Did any kingdom, *about* 1798, manifest the same spirit? Yes, France—she denied the being of God, in her national capacity, and made war on the "Monarchy of Heaven." "Spiritually" this power "is called Sodom." What was the characteristic sin of Sodom? *Licentiousness.* Did France have this character? She did,—*fornication* was established *by law* during the period spoken of. "Spiritually" the place was "where our Lord was crucified." Was this true in France? It was, in more senses than one. *First*, in 1572 a plot was laid in France to destroy all the pious Huguenots; and in one night, *fifty thousand* of them were murdered in cold blood, and the streets of Paris literally ran with blood. Thus our Lord was "spiritually crucified" in his members. *Again;* the watch-word and motto of the French Infidels was, "CRUSH THE WRETCH;" meaning Christ. Thus it may be truly said, "where our Lord was crucified." The very spirit of the "bottomless pit" was poured out in that wicked nation.

But did France "make war" on the Bible? She did; and in 1793 a decree passed the French Assembly, forbidding the Bible, and under that decree, the Bibles were gathered and burned, and every possible mark of contempt heaped upon them, and all the institutions of the Bible abolished; the Sabbath was blotted out, and every *tenth* day substituted for mirth and profanity. Baptism and the communion were abolished. The being of God was denied; and death pronounced to be an *eternal* sleep. The Goddess of Reason was set up, in the person of a vile woman, and publicly worshipped. Surely here is a power that exactly answers the prophecy. But let us examine this point still further.

Digitized by Google

Verse 9: "And they of the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations, shall see their dead bodies three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves."

The language of this verse denotes the feelings of other nations than the one committing the outrage on the witnesses. They would see what war infidel France had made on the Bible, but would not be led, nationally, to engage in the wicked work, nor suffer the murdered witnesses to be *buried*, or put out of sight among themselves, though they lay dead three days and a half, that is, three years and a half, in France. No, this very attempt of France served to arouse Christians everywhere to put forth a new exertion in behalf of the Bible, as we shall presently see.

Verse 10: "And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another, because these two prophets tormented them that dwell on the earth."

This denotes the joy those felt who hated the Bible, or were tormented by it. Great was the joy of infidels everywhere, for a while. But "the triumphing of the wicked is short;" so was it in France; for their war on the Bible and Christianity had well nigh swallowed them all up. They set out to destroy Christ's "*two* witnesses," but they filled France with blood and horror, so that they were horror-struck at the result of their wicked deeds, and were glad to remove their impious hands from the Bible.

Verse 11: "And after three days and a half, the Spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them."

In 1793, the decree passed the French Assembly suppressing the Bible. Just three years after, a resolution was introduced into the Assembly going to supersede the decree, and giving toleration to the Scriptures. That resolution lay on the table six months, when it was taken up, and passed without a dissenting vote. Thus, in just three years and a half, the wit

Digitized by Google

nesses "stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them that saw them." Nothing but the appalling results of the rejection of the Bible, could have induced France to take its hands off these witnesses.

Verse 12: "And they heard a great voice from heaven, saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud, and their enemies beheld them."

"Ascended up to heaven." To understand this expression, see Daniel iv. 22: "Thy greatness is grown, and *reacheth unto heaven*." Here we see that the expression signifies *great exaltation*. Have the Scriptures attained to such a state of exaltation as here indicated, since France made war upon them? They have. Shortly after, the British Bible Society was organized; then followed the American Bible Society, and these, with their almost innumerable auxiliaries, scattering the Bible everywhere. The Bible has been translated into nearly 200 different languages, since that period, that it was never in before; and then the improvements in paper-making and printing, within the last forty years, have given a power in scattering Bibles unparalleled.

The Bible has been sent to the destitute, literally, by *ship-loads*. One vessel carried out from England fifty-nine tons of Bibles for the emancipated slaves in the West Indies. The Bible has had almost all classes in community engaged, either directly or indirectly, in sending it abroad. The Bible has risen to be respected by almost every one, whether saint or sinner. The infidel is ashamed to speak against that book in decent company: he must go to the grogshop, or some other place of infamy, if he expects to have hearers to his mad frothings against the Bible. It is exalted as above all price, and as the most invaluable blessing of God to man, next to his Son, and as the glorious *testimony* concerning that Son. Yes, the Scriptures may truly be said to be exalted "to heaven in a cloud," *a cloud* being an emblem of heavenly dignity.

Digitized by Google

Verse 13: And the same hour, [period or time,] was there a great earthquake, [*revolution*,] and a tenth part of the city fell. What city? See chap. xvii. 18: "And the *woman* which thou sawest, is that *great city* which reigneth over the kings [kingdoms] of the earth." That city is the *Papal* Roman power. France is *one* of the "*ten* horns" that gave "their power and strength unto the [*papal*] beast; or is one of the ten kingdoms that arose out of the western empire of Rome, as indicated by the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image, Daniel's ten-horned beast, and John's ten-horned dragon. France, then, was a tenth part of the city;" and was one of the strongest ministers of Papal vengeance; but in this revolution it "fell," and with it fell the last *civil* messenger of Papal fury. "And in the earthquake were slain of men [margin, *names of men*, or TITLES *of men*] seven thousand." France made war, in her revolution of 1798 and onward, on all titles and nobility. It is said, by those who have examined the French records, that just seven thousand titles of men were abolished in that revolution. "And the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven." Their God-dishonoring and heaven-defying work filled France with such scenes of blood, carnage, and horror, as made even the Infidels themselves to tremble and stand aghast, and the "remnant," that escaped the horrors of that hour, "gave glory to God," not willingly, but the God of heaven caused this "wrath of man to praise him," by giving all the world to see, that those who make war on heaven, make graves for themselves: thus glory redounded to God by the very means that wicked men employed to tarnish that glory.

I will here introduce an extract, on the French Revolution, from Dr. Croly, a minister of the Church of England. He says:

"France, from the commencement of the Papal supremacy, had been the chief champion of the popedom; so early as the ninth century, had given it tem-

Digitized by Google

poral dominion; and continued, through all ages, fully to merit the title of 'Eldest Son of the Church.' But France had received in turn the fatal legacy of persecution. From the time of the Albigenses, through the wars of the League, and the struggles of the Protestant Church during the seventeenth century, closing with its ruin, by the revocation of the edict of Nantes, in 1685, the history of France was written on every page with the blood of the Reformed. Frequently contesting the personal claims of the popes to authority, but submissively bowing down to the doctrines, ceremonial, and principles of Rome, France was the most eager, restless, and ruthless of all the ministers of Papal vengeance.

"In a moment all this submission was changed into the direst hostility. At the exact close of the prophetic period, in 1793, the 1260th year from the birth of the Papal supremacy, a power new to all eyes suddenly started up among nations: an Infidel Democracy! France, rending away her ancient robes of loyalty and laws, stood before mankind a spectacle of naked crime. And, as if to strike the lesson of ruin deeper into the minds of all, on the very eve of this overthrow, the French monarchy had been the most flourishing of continental Europe—the acknowledged leader in manners, arts, and arms—unrivalled in the brilliant frivolities which fill so large a space in the hearts of mankind—its language universal—its influence boundless—its polity the centre round which the European sovereignties perpetually revolved—its literature the fount from which all nations 'in their golden urns drew light.' Instantly, as by a single blow of the divine wrath, the land was covered with civil slaughter. Every star of her glittering firmament was shaken from its sphere; her throne was crushed into dust; her church of forty thousand clergy was scattered, exiled, ruined; all the bonds and appliances which once compacted her with the general European commonwealth, were burst asunder, and cast aside for a conspiracy against mankind. Still

Digitized by Google

there was to be a deeper celebration of the mystery of evil. The spirit which had filled and tortured every limb of France with rebellion to man, now put forth a fiercer malice, and blasphemed. Hostility was declared against all that bore the name of religion. By an act of which history, in all its depths and recesses of national guilt, had never found an example —a crime too blind for the blindest ages of barbarism, and too atrocious for the hottest corruptions of the pagan world, France, the leader of civilized Europe, publicly pronounced that there was no God. The decree was rapidly followed by every measure which could make the blasphemy practical and national. The municipality of Paris, the virtual government, proclaimed, that as they had defied earthly monarchy, 'they would now dethrone the monarchy of heaven.' On the 7th of November, 1793, Gobet, the Bishop of Paris, attended by his vicars general, entered the hall of the legislature, tore off his ecclesiastical robes, and abjured Christianity, declaring that 'the only religion thenceforth should be the religion of liberty, equality, and morality.' His language was echoed with acclamation. A still more consummate blasphemy was to follow. Within a few days after, the municipality presented a veiled female to the assembly as the Goddess of Reason, with the fearful words, 'There is no God; the worship of Reason shall exist in his stead.' The assembly bowed before her and worshipped. She was then borne in triumph to the cathedral of Paris, placed on the high altar, and worshipped by the public authorities and the people. The name of the cathedral was thenceforth the Temple of Reason. Atheism was enthroned. Treason to the majesty of God had reached its height. No more gigantic insult could be hurled against heaven.

"But persecution had still its work. All the churches of the republic were closed. All the rites of religion were forbidden. Baptism and the communion were to be administered no more. The seventh day was to be no longer sacred, but a tenth was substituted,

Digitized by Google

and on that day a public orator was appointed to read a discourse on the wisdom of Atheism. The reign of the demon was now resistless. While Voltaire and Marat (infidelity and massacre personified) were raised to the honors of idolatry, the tombs of the kings, warriors, and statesmen of France were torn open, and the relics of men, whose names were a national glory, tossed about in the licentious sport of the populace. Immortality was publicly pronounced a dream; and on the gates of the cemeteries was written, 'Death is an eternal sleep!' In this general outburst of frenzy, all the forms and feelings of religion, true or false, were alike trodden under the feet of the multitude. The Scriptures, the lamps of the holy place, had fallen in the general fall of the temple. But they were not without their peculiar indignity. The copies of the Bible were publicly insulted; they were contemptuously burned in the havoc of the religious libraries. In Lyons, the capital of the south, where Protestanism had once erected her especial church, and where still a remnant worshipped in its ruins, an ass was actually made to drink the wine out of the communion cup, and was afterwards led in public procession through the streets, dragging the Bible at its heels. The example of these horrors stimulated the daring of infidelity in every part of the continent. France, always modelling the mind of Europe, now still more powerfully impressed her image, while every nation was beginning to glow with fires like her own. Recklessness, licentiousness, and blasphemy were the characters and credentials by which the leaders of overthrow, in every land, ostentatiously proceeded to make good their claims to French regeneration. The Scriptures, long lost to the people in the whole extent of Romish Christendom, were now still more decisively undone. No effort was made to reinstate them, by the Romish Church. Thus spake the prophecy, 'They shall lie in the street of the great city.'"

Now let me ask my reader, Have we made a right

Digitized by Google

application of this portion of the word of the Lord? If so, where are we now in prophetic history? *Mark.* The tremendous scenes in France close up the second wo. *Verse* 14: "The second wo is *past.*" That is, the second wo trumpet, which was the *sixth* trumpet in the series. If we are correct in the interpretation of this chapter, we are *past* the sixth trumpet and second wo! What follows?—☞ "BEHOLD." *Mark it—be not deceived—O hear—see—listen*, all ye ends of the earth—"*Behold*, the *third wo* [*the last*] cometh QUICKLY."

Where are we now? Looking for a "temporal millennium!!!" *a thousand years* of "peace and safety!!" O that the thunder of the midnight cry might wake up such souls. Once more let me utter the angel's cry, "Behold, the *third wo* cometh *quickly.*"

Verses 15 *to* 18: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever. And the four and twenty elders which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy [margin—'*corrupt*'] the earth."

The seventh angel, then, will "quickly" sound—then the wicked will be "*destroyed*," *not* "*converted*"—then the dead are to be "*judged*"—then the "*saints*" are to be "*rewarded*"—then will the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord, and his Christ, and he shall reign for *ever and ever.* Then will the stone have smitten the "image upon his *feet*," and all the kingdoms of this earth will be dashed in

Digitized by Google

pieces. Then will the saints of the Most High take the kingdom and possess it *forever*, even FOREVER AND EVER.

O my fellow-men, I beseech you *awake*, AWAKE, AWAKE, before that glorious day to saints, but dreadful, *awfully dreadful* day to sinners overtake you. In the name of the Lord, I beseech you, *awake*. O ye ministers of Christ, *awake*. Souls are looking up to you for direction at this hour. If you by a *word*, a *look*, or a *gesture*, seem but to say, "it is all *moonshine*, *humbuggery*;" or anything by which your hearers can infer that you think they have no cause of alarm, you may peril their souls, and their blood may be required at your hands. You do not know that it will not come *this year*. Many of you say, yourselves, "No man knoweth the day nor the hour." Then *you* do *not know* that it *will not* come *this year*. I pray you, then, don't strengthen the hands of the wicked. O remember "*the third wo cometh quickly*."

Sinner, fly to Christ—the storm will soon fall—a storm before which you will be as incapable of standing as "*stubble*" before the devouring fire. May the Lord incline your heart to heed the warning.

Exposition of Matthew, 24th Chapter.

In contemplating this chapter our minds are apt to be biased by our previous modes of thinking. We seem to suppose that the disciples, in their inquiry, in the third verse, understood that Jerusalem was to be destroyed *before* the *end of the world*, as much as though it was an historical fact at the time. To my mind, it is clear that they had no idea that "*the temple*" was to be destroyed prior to the coming of Christ at the end of the world. The previous chapter closes by our Saviour proclaiming his *future coming*; and as he departed out of the temple, his disciples called his attention to the buildings of the temple. He tells them—

Digitized by Google

"There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." This expression could convey no idea to the minds of the disciples of what we call "*the destruction of Jerusalem*," as an event disconnected with his second coming. Let us consider—he had, just before leaving the temple, spoken of his coming; as he leaves the temple, he speaks of its *utter demolition*. The most natural idea to the minds of the disciples, must be that their Master spoke of the overthrow of those buildings at the *end of the world*, when he would *come again*. In this view, it appears to me, *the question* (for I consider the question *one*) was asked, "When shall *these* things be, and what shall be the *sign of thy coming*, and of the *end of the world?*"

"*These things*"—*what* THINGS? Christ's *coming* and the *end* of the world; to which time, it seems to me, they supposed our Saviour referred, in speaking of the destruction of the temple.

The point, therefore, on which they wanted information was about their Lord's coming and the end of the world. Our Saviour commences a connected chain of events which were to reach from that generation to his coming in the clouds of heaven. From the fourth to the fourteenth verse, he gives them a kind of general description, or synopsis, of events to take place at no very distant period after his leaving them.

Verse 4: "Jesus said unto them, Take heed that *no man deceive you*." He would have them on their guard against deception: knowing the temptations they would have, from the tribulations they were to pass through, to accept of some deliverer who might *profess* to come in Christ's name, to lead them out of their troubles.

Verse 5: "For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many." Many such did arise.

Verses 6 *and* 7: Here our Lord tells his followers of wars, &c., and cautions them against being "*troubled*." These wars did come—Jerusalem was destroyed in one of the first, if not the *very first* of those wars; and

Digitized by Google

by these wars the Roman empire itself was divided into ten kingdoms, according to Daniel's prophecy, chap. vii. 24: "The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings [kingdoms] that shall arise." All this took place before "*the end came*" to paganism, or the "daily," as Daniel calls it.

Verse 9: "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you," &c. "*Then*"—*when?* While these commotions are going on in the Roman empire.

Verse 10: "Then shall many be offended, [stumbled, *apostatize*,] and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another."

It does not come within my design to show *particularly* how this prophecy was fully accomplished under heathen or *pagan* Rome. All acquainted with history know it was fulfilled to the very letter; and it is supposed that not less than three millions of Christians suffered death under that persecuting power.

Verse 11: "And many false prophets [teachers] shall arise, and shall deceive many." The history of the church shows that many such teachers did arise at the period here indicated.

Verse 12: "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." When Christianity became, by profession, the religion of the Roman empire, then the church was corrupted by a worldly policy, and the introduction of heathen customs into their religious services, so that *iniquity* abounded, and the love of many waxed cold; then came the "falling away," spoken of by Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3; thus preparing the way for the appearing of the "*man of sin.*"

Verse 13: "But he that shall endure unto the end [*death*—see Rev. ii. 10,] the same shall be saved." The trials of those days should be severe, but *faithfulness* "unto death" should be rewarded with "a *crown of life.*"

Verse 14: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be

Digitized by Google

preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."

The inquiry arises—The *end of what?* Some say, the end of the Jewish economy, or of their *nationality;* others say, the end of *the world.* I cannot adopt the first position; because, it appears to me, our Saviour was speaking of *an end* that was to come *after* a bloody persecution of his followers, and a *falling away* in consequence of the *abounding of iniquity,* [verse 12,] and not that only, but also of many wars. These things did not all take place before the destruction of Jerusalem. If I am not much mistaken, the first war, of any importance, after our Saviour, was that in which Jerusalem was destroyed; and the Saviour told his disciples that the end was "not yet" when those wars commenced. See verse 6.

I cannot adopt the interpretation, that the *end* spoken of in the 14th verse is the *end of the world.* Not that *that* interpretation is an objection to the end of the world being *now* at hand, as some suppose, but because, if that construction is true, the world should have come to an end long ago. The apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans, x. 16, says, "They have not all obeyed the gospel;" and adds, 18th verse, "I say, Have they not heard? *Yes,* verily, their sound went into *all the earth,* and their words unto the *ends of the world.*" Compare this with Acts ii. 1—5: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, OUT OF EVERY NATION UNDER HEAVEN." Thus it was true that the sound went into *all the earth,* and their words unto the *ends of the world,* in the days of the apostles. And

Digitized by Google

again, in Colossians i. 5, 6: "The truth of the gospel, which is come unto you, as it is *in all the world*." And again, at the 23d verse: "If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the *gospel*, which ye have heard, and which *was preached to every creature under heaven;* whereof I, Paul, am made a minister." To my mind, it seems next to impossible to reconcile this testimony of the apostle with the idea that the gospel has not, hundreds of years ago, been "preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." Hence, I am compelled to look for some other interpretation of the 14th verse. The "*end*" of something is spoken of in that verse, which, it would seem, was brought about by the *agency* of the gospel. By the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom in all the world for a witness, or *testimony*, some kind of a change or *revolution* was to be effected that should bring an "*end*" to something. The inquiry returns—what is that *something?* In my opinion, it was that *persecuting power* of which the Saviour had spoken in the previous verses; in other words, it was *Pagan* Rome, paganism, or the same power called by Daniel "THE DAILY."

Let us see if we can determine what we are to understand by the "*daily* sacrifice," spoken of in Daniel 8th, 11th, and 12th. It will be seen by a reference to those chapters, that the word "*sacrifice*," connected with "*daily*," is in *italics*, and therefore is not in the original text, but has been supplied by our translators. The expression in those texts is perfect without the supplied word, and the sense much clearer. The text, Dan. viii. 13, is simply "the *daily*, and the transgression of desolation:" and in the 11th chap. 31st verse, it is, "They shall take away *the daily*, and they shall place the *abomination* that maketh desolate." This language shows that "the *daily*" is a daily or *continual abomination*, or desolating power, that should desolate the people and church of God till it was *taken* "*away*," and that then should come up *another* abom-

Digitized by Google

ination to take its place, still more desolating: then, in the 12th chap. 11th verse, the *time* is given us *from* the taking away of the daily "to set up [as the margin has it] the abomination that maketh desolate," and that time carries us to the taking "away the dominion" [Dan. vii. 26] of this last abomination.

That these things do not relate to anything done by Antiochus Epiphanes, is certain from the fact that Antiochus died 164 years before our Lord's birth, and Christ directed his followers to look for the "abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel," as *still future.*

Some tell us the "daily" is the daily sacrifice of the Jews, which was taken away at the destruction of Jerusalem. If so, can they tell what event took place answering to the 1290 days, which, if understood as literal days, can be made to agree with no event? Then it is added, "Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the 1335 days." What took place then? Nothing that marks that as a peculiar period. It was at the end of those days that Daniel was to *stand* in his *lot*, or have his resurrection. Did he have it 1335 days after the destruction of Jerusalem? If the days stand for years, what event, answering to the prophecy, took place 1290 years from the cessation of the Jewish sacrifices? It was in the darkness of Papal Rome. Did Daniel have his resurrection under the dark reign of Papacy? We have nothing in history to show that anything took place at the end of those days, if reckoned from Jerusalem's destruction.

We are now led to inquire what "*daily*" it was that was "taken away." I answer, it appears to me, clearly, it was the daily or *continual* abomination of *paganism*, which oppressed the people and church of God till it was "taken out of the way;" which event, it seems, from Gibbon's History of Rome, took place about A. D. 508, when "Vitalian, a Gothic chieftain, with an army of Huns and Bulgarians, declared themselves the *champions of the Catholic faith.*" Thus an end came to pagan sacrifices at Rome, or paganism

Digitized by Google

was "taken out of the way" and no longer "*hindered*" the revelation of the "man of sin," or "abomination that maketh desolate," i. e., *Papacy*. What event transpired 1290 days from the taking away of paganism, or the "*daily*," in 508? 1290 years from that time, viz., in 1798, Berthier, a French general, entered Rome, deposed the Pope, abolished the Justinian code of laws, under which the Pope had carried on his "*war with the saints*" for 1260 years, and gave to Italy a republican form of government, carried the Pope captive to France, where he died in 1799:—thus was the "*dominion*" of Papacy taken "away, to consume and destroy unto the end." See Dan. vii. 26. The 1335 days, or years, from the taking away of "the daily" in 508, carry us down to 1843, when Daniel, with all the saints, will *stand in their lot, i. e.*, will be raised from the dead.

"The *daily*," then, and "the abomination of desolation," are two desolating powers acting against the people and church of God. An *end* comes to one, and then the other comes up in its place.

The gospel of the kingdom, Mark says, xiii. 10, "must *first* be published among all nations." This was done in the apostles' days, as we have already seen; but the influence of it did not at once work the revolution by which *paganism fell:* but it began to work its fall, and at length produced that change, by which Constantine declared in favor of Christianity in the fourth century; but paganism had its temple and altar at Rome still, and was not utterly thrown down, or "*taken away*," till about A. D. 508, when "Vitalian, with an army of *Huns and Bulgarians*, mostly idolaters, declared themselves the *champions of the Catholic faith*." That mighty revolution caused the *taking away* of the *pagan* rites at Rome, as we have seen, and thus "*the end came*" to the *pagan* persecuting power. But, observe, this was not till after "*a falling away*," as Paul calls it, and "the love of many" waxing "cold," as our Saviour saith. This took place from the time the Roman emperors espoused

Digitized by Google

the cause of the church, and Christianity became the religion of the empire. This prepared the way for the revelation of the "man of sin," or "the abomination that maketh desolate." "*The end came*" to one abomination, or persecuting power "spoken of by Daniel," viz., "the daily;" then, in the 15th verse, our Saviour speaks of the coming up of the other "abomination," and of its *standing* "*in the holy place*," viz., the church; or, as Paul saith, "sitting in the temple of God." See 2 Thess. ii. 4. The mode of persecution is now changed; before, it was heathen, or *pagan;* now it is *professedly Christian.* Christians who lived previous to the coming up of this latter power, foresaw its rise, and were filled with terror at the thought. R. Fleming, of Rotterdam, writing previous to 1693, on "The Fulfilling of Scripture," says, on 2 Thess. 2d chapter, "The mystery of iniquity, even in the times of the apostles, did begin to work, and what for a time withheld his coming, the *heathen* empire of Rome, hath long since been taken out of the way, which caused some Christians, in those days, to wish the standing and continuance of that empire, from the *terror* they had of that adversary, who, according to the word, *they knew was to fill his room.*"

The *end*, then, spoken of by our Saviour, was the end of the "*daily*," or pagan abomination, under which the wars and persecutions had been carried on, spoken of in the previous verses.

Let me now show you the perfect agreement and harmony there is between Daniel, our Lord, and Paul. See Dan. xi. 30: "He shall return, and have intelligence with them that *forsake the holy covenant.*" Compare this with Matt. xxiv. 12: "Because iniquity shall abound, *the love of many shall wax cold:*" also 2 Thess. ii.: "*There shall come a falling away first.*" Now, see again Dan. xi. 31: "They shall *take away the daily.*" Matt. xxiv. 14: "*Then shall the end come.*" 2 Thess. ii. 7: "He who now letteth [hindereth] will let, until *he be taken out of the way.*" See again Dan. xi. 31: "They shall place the *abomination that*

Digitized by Google

maketh desolate." Matt. xxiv. 15: "When ye, therefore, shall see the *abomination of desolation* spoken of by Daniel the prophet, *stand in the holy place.*" 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, 8—after the falling away, "that man of sin" shall "be revealed, so that he, as God, *sitteth in the temple of God.* Then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."

Can there be any doubt here of the *identity* of the *times* and of the *characters* represented by these *three witnesses*, our Lord, Daniel, and Paul? The harmony is too perfect to be overlooked. It seems to me there can be no mistake—the agreement is complete. They are each, evidently, looking to the same events, and each *explains* and *confirms* the other.

The way is now prepared for an examination of *Verses* 15 *to* 28. Our Lord here calls attention *particularly* to a *desolation* which was to extend down to, and be connected *with*, the *signs* of his *immediate* appearance, and notices this desolating power *particularly*, because it would have a more important bearing on the interests of his church than any other matter that was to transpire before his coming. From the application of this part of the chapter to the destruction of Jerusalem, I am compelled to dissent: because I have never been able to make such an interpretation harmonize with what appears to me to be truth.

1st. Our Saviour calls attention expressly to the "abomination of *desolation*, spoken of by Daniel the prophet;" and adds, "Whoso readeth, *let him understand.*" Understand *what?* Why, that the abomination I speak of is not the "*daily*," but the "abomination of *desolation.*" What is the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel? Clearly, not the pagan abomination, as our opponents would have us think, under Antiochus Epiphanes, who died 200 years before our Saviour directed his followers to look for that abomination as still future: nor was it the "*daily*

Digitized by Google

abomination," as most second advent folks hold; nor does a reference to the ninth chapter of Daniel prove that it is; for that chapter speaks of abomina*tions*, *plural;* whereas our Lord speaks of a *particular* abomina*tion*, *singular*, and cautions against a *misunderstanding*. It has often enough been shown that the "*daily*," spoken of by Daniel, is not the Jewish *sacrifices*, but that it is the *pagan*, or *continual* abomination, and relates to a desolating power that should desolate the people and church of God till it should be "*taken away*," and there should come up, in its place, another power called the "*transgression of desolation*" [chap. viii. 13,] and "the abomination that *maketh desolate*," [chapters xi. 31, and xii. 11.] Though they were both *desolating* powers, they are designated by different names, as we have seen.

Now Jerusalem was not destroyed by the "transgression of desolation," or the "abomina*tion* of desolation spoken of by Daniel," but under the reign of the "*daily*" or *pagan* abomination. Then, the desolation, spoken of by our Saviour, was not the destruction of Jerusalem.

2d. The abomination of desolation was to be a "*sign*" to Christians; but it was to be so only when they should "*see*" it "*stand* IN the *holy place*." Where was the *holy place* at Jerusalem? Certainly it was not outside the city; for that is nowhere called, in the Scriptures, "THE *holy place*." *The* holy place was not only *in the city*, but *in the temple* at Jerusalem. But *that* was not *the holy place* at the time that wicked city was destroyed; for God had *departed* from that wicked people,—Christ had ascended into the *true holy of holies*, and the sacrifices which the Jews continued to offer in the temple were no better than the heathen sacrifices; because the very offering of them, after the death of Christ, was a daily denial and rejection of the Lord of glory. But admitting that within the temple was the holy place at the time of Jerusalem's destruction, the Christians did not *see* the Roman or *pagan* abomination "*stand in*" it at the time they fled out of the city—

Digitized by Google

the Romans had not yet entered the city; besides, the Roman or "*daily*" abomination never did "stand *in* the holy place," for that was destroyed, immediately on the taking of the city, by the burning of the temple. How then could that be a *sign* which *in fact* never took place, either *before* or *after* the Christians left Jerusalem?

3d. The connexion shows that the *fleeing* was of a more *general character* than of those in the city. "Neither let him that is in the *field* return back to take his clothes," v. 10. It looks like a general time of trouble to the church.

4th. Apply this description to the destruction of Jerusalem, and it appears impossible to reconcile it with what is said in verse 21: "Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." How can this be true, if our Saviour was speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem? Surely the destruction of the old world by a flood was *a greater* tribulation, and also the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah; and a greater one is still to come, when "the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up;" when "*all* the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble, and the day that cometh *shall burn them up*."

5th. If Jerusalem's destruction is the subject of discourse, I cannot see the truth of the 22d verse: "Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

If all the Jews in Jerusalem had perished in the siege, there would have been "flesh" or persons "saved." If it be said, it means none of the "elect," or Christians, would have been saved if Titus had not, for a time, so far have withdrawn his army as to have given them a chance to escape—I reply, if every Christian in Jerusalem had perished, it would have been very far from cutting off all Christians, as churches had been planted almost all over the then known world, before Jerusalem was destroyed.

Digitized by Google

6th. *Lastly.* Our Saviour says, v. 29: "*Immediately* after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened," &c.; and he adds, v. 30, "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven—and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory."

Now, as this was not *literally true*, immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, we must resort to a *figurative* interpretation, (which would leave us in the wide fields of conjecture,) or understand our Lord as speaking of a different matter from Jerusalem's downfall.

I now ask if it is likely that our Saviour would speak so much at length, and particularly, of the destruction of Jerusalem, and only *darkly* hint at, if mention at all, a far more dreadful calamity to his church, viz., its desolation under Papacy? I think not.

It appears to me, that the "abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel" is none other than the *Papal* abomination. By its *standing in the holy place*, I understand its rising up in the church; and is none other than Paul's "man of sin" who "*sitteth in the temple of God.*" Let us again look at the correspondence between our Lord's description and that of Paul. Our Saviour says, v. 12, "The love of many *shall wax cold.*" Paul says, 2 Thess. ii. 3, "There" will "come a *falling away* first." Saith our Lord, v. 15, "The abomination of desolation" shall be *seen standing* "in the holy place." Paul says, the "man of sin" shall "be revealed," "*sitting in the temple of God.*" Can we mistake in the fact that Christ and Paul have their eye on the same desolation of the church?

When Christians should see this desolating power "*stand* in the holy place"—the church—"then let" all Christians, wherever that anti-Christian power should sway, "*flee*," and not stop to save "anything out of their houses," nor "return back" from their "fields to take their clothes"—then "wo to them that" have little children, &c., in those times of per-

Digitized by Google

secution and *flight* from place to place; and "pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day;" i. e., that the persecution may not be permitted to rage with such fury as to allow you no respite from trouble, or time for rest; "for then shall be great tribulation [to the church,] such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, [how true,] no, nor ever shall be;" such a time of trouble to the church is never to return. "And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved," i. e., none of the church; "but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." The severity of that tribulation began to be broken before the 1260 days or years expired that the church was to remain in the "mountains," i. e., "wilderness," [see Rev. xii. 6;] the kings began to make war on that desolating power [see Rev. xvii. 16] 200 years before the whole period allotted to it had expired, and the "Reformation" commenced about the same time; and thus the days, in the violence of the persecution, were "shortened," and for the sake of the "elect," the church.

Verse 23: "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not."—"*Then*." *When?* Under this papal abomination. The Pope has claimed to be Christ's vicegerent; i. e., to be intrusted with Christ's power to pardon sins, and has "exalted himself above all that is called God." See 2 Thess. ii. 4.

Verse 24: "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch, that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Compare this with the Papal Beast, Rev. xiii. 13: "He doeth great *wonders*, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by those *miracles* which he had power to do." See also Rev. xvii. 8: "They that dwell on the earth shall wonder [whose names were not written in the book of life," not "the elect,"] "when they behold the beast," &c. Papacy has shown, or *pretended* to show,

Digitized by Google

"*great signs and wonders*," so that some of the "elect" have been deceived by it, I have no doubt; for it must be true that there have been true Christians in that wicked church, though they would not have remained in it if they had not been *deceived*, any more than they would remain in any other church that *lords it over God's heritage*.

Verse 26: "Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert"—in places of *seclusion* from the world—"go not forth: Behold, he is in the secret chambers"—*convents—nunneries*—"believe it not."

The 27th verse teaches us that when Christ comes, it will be in such a manner we shall none of us have occasion to *doubt* on the subject, for his coming will be as the lightning—*sudden*, and *visible* to all.

Verse 28: "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together."—This verse may refer to the bloodthirsty character of the Papal power. See Job xxxix. 27—30: Papacy, like the eagle, "seeketh her prey, and her eyes behold afar off;" her devotees "suck up" the "blood" of the saints; and "where the slain are there is she," carrying on bloody persecutions.

If this interpretation does not satisfy, take another. The eagle is led to her prey by her *appetite;* so when Christ comes, as the lightning, men will be divided according as their *affections* are on things above or things on earth. If their hearts are on Christ they will *fly* up to meet him, as the prophet Isaiah saith, xl. 31: "They that wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles," while the wicked shall remain to burned up with the objects of their affections, i. e., earthly things.

To the interpretation I have given of the 15th to the 28th verse, the 21st of Luke, 20th—24th verses, may be urged as an objection. It will be seen that Mark uses nearly the same language as Matthew. Luke wrote after, and his gospel records points omitted by the other evangelists. Now, admitting that our

Digitized by Google

Lord did speak of Jerusalem's destruction, as recorded by Luke xxi. 20, I conceive it does not affect my argument on Matthew; for it will be seen that the language differs from both Matthew and Mark; the latter having called attention to the "abomination of *desolation*," which is no other than the *papal* abomination. My own opinion is, that Luke records an expression of our Lord omitted by the other evangelists, which may refer to *old* Jerusalem or it may not; if it does, it is only by *glancing* over it to the main object, the desolations of his church under the abomination of desolation; for the testimony of TWO WITNESSES settles the point that it was THAT abomination, and not the "*daily*" abomination: nor yet are BOTH abominations included; for our Lord uses the *singular*, abomina*tion*, and designates which one he is speaking of, and enforces it with an emphatic "*Whoso readeth let him understand.*" By Jerusalem, then, in Luke, I understand the same that Paul, in 2 Thess. ii. 4, calls "the temple of God," i. e., the *church of God*. By its being "compassed about with *armies*," [not *army*,] I understand the *civil power*, in the hands of Papacy, wielding the *sword*, hunting the church, the true children of God, to put them to death. As though our Lord had said, "The abomination of desolation will stand up in the church and possess power to command kings and their armies: and when you see him thus stand in the church, know that the desolation thereof is nigh—*then flee*—yea, depart out of it, for she has then become Babylon; then *come out of her, my people*, and let none enter into it."

The "wrath upon this people," I understand not the wrath of God, for the wrath was upon the *fleeing* people, and of course was the wrath of the persecuting power, or the abomination of desolation, Papacy; before this power they *fell* "by the sword, and" were "led away captive," &c. This exactly agrees with what we are told, Daniel xi. 33, should befall Christians under the papal abomination, i. e., "They shall fall *by the sword*, by flame, and *by captivity*, and by spoil

Digitized by Google

many days." Thus we see Luke and Daniel agree perfectly. Again: Luke says, "Jerusalem shall be *trodden down* of the Gentiles, until the TIMES of the Gentiles be fulfilled." The Revelator says, Rev. xi. 2, "The holy city shall they "[the Gentiles] TREAD UNDER FOOT FORTY AND TWO MONTHS." Here we have the TIME of the treading under foot specified; and the language so exactly corresponds with Luke, that the one explains the other, and without this explanation the "TIMES of the Gentiles," in Luke, would seem to be an indefinite expression. Further, Christians were to "flee to the mountains," according to Luke. The church was to "fly into the *wilderness*," according to the Revelator. Again I ask, What Christians were to be benefited by the directions to *flee*, if old Jerusalem was the subject of discourse?—surely but a mere moiety of the whole church in the world at that time. We know not that any of the apostles were there, and but comparatively few Christians. But, says the objector, "*All* the Christians did flee out of Jerusalem before it was destroyed." And who is their authority for this assertion? Why, "Josephus." And how did Josephus *know* that "*all* the Christians fled" at that time? Strange, that Josephus had so much *knowledge* as to know every *individual* Christian in Jerusalem, and *know* they all fled!!—he must have been almost *omniscient*. I strongly suspect it was the "LITTLE HORN THAT HAD EYES," "spoken of by Daniel the prophet," that *saw* all the Christians "fleeing out of Jerusalem;" and that it SAW THAT just as it has seen "Antiochus Epiphanes" as the LITTLE HORN; i. e., Papacy must find something to which to apply the "abomination of desolation" of which our Saviour spake, Matt. xxiv., and it conjured up *old* Jerusalem, and Christians fleeing out of it, to turn eyes off from *itself*; and Protestants have been deceived by it, just as they have about Antiochus, and with just as good evidence, in my judgment.*

* Since writing the above a friend has informed me that Pres. Wilbur Fisk stated, that, in his visit to Rome, which

Digitized by Google

Verse 26: "*Immediately* after the tribulation of those days," &c. Mark says, "*In* those days, after that tribulation," &c., "shall the sun be darkened," &c. I understand this to be a *literal* event, or *sign* of Christ's coming. How exactly does the history agree with the prophecy! "*In* those days," i. e., the 1260 allotted to the "abomination of desolation," and yet *after* the tribulation of the church, from that power, had passed, the sun was *literally darkened*. In 1780, May 19, the sun rose clear—at ten o'clock, the horizon began to be darkened, and at twelve people had to light candles to dine—laborers left the fields—the fowls retired to roost—and a feeling that the judgment day had come rested upon many minds.

"*The moon shall not give her light.*" The darkness not only continued through the day, but the night following till past midnight, though the moon was at the full. "Such was the darkness, that a sheet of white paper, held within a few inches of the eyes, was equally invisible as the blackest velvet." An eye-witness says, that when the moon first became visible, it had precisely the appearance of "blood." The prophet Joel, ii. 30, 31, says, "I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, *before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.*" We have seen that this prophecy has been fulfilled so far as the sun and moon are concerned. If it be said, "This darkness can be accounted for upon natural principles," I reply —it never has been done; but if it could be, it does not alter the fact. Our Saviour said it should take place, but did not say it could *not* be accounted for upon *natural principles*. It has taken place as he said: nor is there any evidence that such an event ever transpired before, since the crucifixion, till 1780.

was a short time before his death, he found, at the Vatican, the oldest copy of Josephus that is known; he also said that in that copy there is no mention made of the Christians *fleeing out of Jerusalem* at its destruction.

Digitized by Google

"*Fire and pillars of smoke*," says the prophet Joel. Has this sign been seen? It has. Luke calls it "*fearful sights and great signs from heaven.*" The *Aurora Borealis*, or *Northern Lights*, are a perfect fulfilment of this prophecy. But it is said, "They are no sign of the end of the world, for they have always been." But where, I ask, is the proof that they have always been? Who can find a particle of *ancient* history in support of that idea? It is true, that some *modern* writers have *asserted* that there is; but have they been able to put their finger on such *anciently written* history? If so, where is it? Till they produce it, we shall deny that there is any such history in existence. It seems, from some of our *modern* historians, that in March, 1716, these lights were first seen with great brilliancy and *astonishment* in England, though never seen before by the oldest inhabitants. Since that period they have often been seen, and especially within the last thirty or forty years, exactly answering to the prophecy of "*fire and pillars of smoke.*"

The following article is in illustration of this subject, and may be seen in the New York Commercial Advertiser of Oct. 22d, 1839. "The phenomenon described in this London article was seen by myself," says HENRY JONES, "and on the same Tuesday evening of Sept. 3d, especially of the Aurora, in the western part of New York, and is described by various papers of this city, as seen here and at Boston at the same time, with unprecedented splendor, brilliancy, and singularity of appearance, though far less astonishing than their described appearance in London, and with nothing special in regard to appearances in the stars." [See New York Commercial Advertiser of Sept. 4th, and Christian Advocate and Journal of Sept. 13.]

FROM LATE LONDON PAPERS.

"*London, Sept. 5th.*—Between the hours of ten on Tuesday night and three yesterday morning, in the

Digitized by Google

heavens was observed one of the most magnificent specimens of those extraordinary phenomena—the falling stars and northern lights—witnessed for many years past. The first indication of this singular phenomenon was about ten minutes before ten, when a light crimson, apparently vapor, rose from the northern portion of the hemisphere, and gradually extended to the centre of the heavens, and by ten o'clock, or a quarter past, the whole, from east to west, was one vast sheet of light. It had a most alarming appearance, and was exactly like that occasioned by a TERRIFIC FIRE. The light varied considerably; at one time it seemed to fall, and directly after rose with intense brightness. There were to be seen mingled with it VOLUMES OF SMOKE, which rolled over and over, and every beholder seemed convinced that it was 'a tremendous conflagration.' The consternation in the metropolis was very great; thousands of persons were running in the direction of the supposed awful catastrophe. The engines belonging to the fire brigade stations in Baker street, Farrington street, Watling street, Warterloo road, and likewise those belonging to the West of England station—in fact, every fire-engine in London—were horsed, and galloped after the supposed 'scene of destruction,' with more than ordinary energy, followed by carriages, horsemen, and vast mobs. Some of the engines proceeded as far as Highgate and Holloway, before the error was discovered. These appearances lasted for upwards of two hours, and towards morning the spectacle became one of more grandeur.

"At two o'clock in the morning, the phenomenon presented a most gorgeous scene, and one very difficult to describe. The whole of London was illuminated as light as noonday, and the atmosphere was remarkably clear. The southern hemisphere at the time mentioned, although unclouded, was very dark; but the stars, which were innumerable, shone beautifully. The opposite side of the heavens presented a singular, but magnificent contrast: it was clear to

Digitized by Google

extreme, and the light was very vivid; there was a continual succession of meteors, which varied in splendor. They appeared formed in the centre of the heavens, and spread till they seemed to burst; the effect was electrical; myriads of small stars shot out over the horizon, and darted with that swiftness towards the earth that the eye scarcely could follow the track; they seemed to burst also, and to throw a dark crimson vapor over the entire hemisphere. The colors were most magnificent. At half past two o'clock, the spectacle changed to darkness, which, on dispersing, displayed a luminous rainbow in the zenith of the heavens, and round the ridge of darkness that overhung the southern portion of the country. Soon afterwards, columns of silvery light radiated from it;—they increased wonderfully, intermingled among crimson vapor which formed at the same time, and when at full height the spectacle was beyond all imagination. Stars were darting about in all directions, and continued until four o'clock, when all died away. During the time that they lasted, a great many persons assembled on the bridges across the river Thames, where they had a commanding view of the heavens, and watched the progress of the phenomenon attentively."

It is difficult to conceive how a more perfect fulfilment of the prophecy could take place. God never has, and we have no reason to believe he ever will, give signs that unbelieving men cannot cavil with. He gives men sufficient evidence to satisfy the childlike mind, but allows "*strong delusions*" to follow all his signs, that men who do not *love* the truth may believe a *lie*. They ask for lies, and God suffers them to have them, "that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." So when Moses cast down his rod and it became a serpent, the magicians did *likewise*. "It can be accounted for upon *natural principles*," cries Pharoah, and all the *anti-types*, that, Pharaoh-like, *contemn* all the signs the great God is giving us of the coming of Christ and the end of the world. God will never give such

Digitized by Google

men signs that they cannot scoff at, till the *last sign*, that of the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven; but then it will be too late, and they are lost forever.

"*The stars shall fall from heaven.*" This is another sign of the near approach of Christ and the end of the world. The Revelator says, chap. vi. 13, "The stars of heaven fell upon the earth, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." Has this sign been seen? It has. Nov. 13th, 1833, was seen precisely such an appearance as the Revelator describes. Though "shooting stars" have been seen at other times, so far as known, nothing of *this kind* was ever seen before 1789. The atmosphere was literally filled with falling stars, shooting in every direction, answering exactly to the description in Rev. vi. 13. If that was not a fulfilment of the prophecy, it will be difficult for any man to show how it ever can be fulfilled.

"*Blood*" is one of the signs given us by Joel, to precede the "*terrible day* of the Lord." Has this sign appeared? It has. In addition to the bloody appearance of the *moon*, already spoken of, in February, 1837, the whole face of the earth seemed as though covered with blood, the *snow* having exactly that appearance.

"*Pestilences*" were to "be in divers places," Luke tells us. Who has forgotten the terrible and desolating *cholera*, that has passed over almost the entire world within the past twenty years? If that is not a fulfilment of that prophecy, it is difficult to see how it could be fulfilled.

"*Earthquakes* in divers places" was to be another SIGN. Not to mention the many shocks which have more or less affected various places, look at the one felt at St. Domingo the past year, in which a *whole city*, of some ten or twelve thousand inhabitants, is swallowed up, and a mere handful of souls saved.

All the signs our Saviour spoke of as preceding his coming have appeared, and the next thing to be looked for is the "COMING" of the "Son of Man in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." This appearance, it is true, is to be preceded by its "sign," v. 30. But what is that sign? I pretend not to know with *certainty*, but perhaps we may get a clew to it from Numbers xxiv. 17: "There shall come a *Star* out of Jacob, and a SCEPTRE shall arise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners [or, as the margin has it, 'through the princes'] of Moab, and *destroy* all the children of Sheth," or the wicked.

Digitized by Google

A "*Star*" was *the* SIGN to the wise men of the East at our Saviour's birth: may not the "*Sceptre*," or sign of *Royalty*, be the forerunner of his second coming? He comes to set up his everlasting kingdom, having been into "a far country to receive" it, and is now to "*return*," when his "enemies, who would not that" he "should reign over them," shall be SLAIN "before" him.

Verse 31: "He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, [see 1 Cor. xv. 52,] and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." What a glorious meeting of the children of God!—they meet to part no more—meet to share the purchased inheritance with their ONCE SUFFERING but NOW GLORIFIED Lord and Saviour. O blessed state! O glorious hour! Reader, would you have a part in it? Hasten, then; make no delay to be reconciled to God—"kiss the Son," lest you "perish from the way" when his "wrath" shall be kindled by your obstinate slighting his mercy.

Verses 32, 33: "Now learn a parable of the fig-tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, *know* that it is near, at the door."

Just as certain as we can know the approach of summer by the putting forth of leaves, just *so certain* we may *know* that the coming of Christ is *now* at the door.

Verse 34. This verse is supposed to form an *objection* to the foregoing application, and to fix the meaning of our Lord to events to transpire in that age, because he says, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled."

The term *generation* is applied not only to an *age*, but a *class* or *race*. First, to the *righteous;* see Ps. xiv. 5: "God is in the generation of the righteous." See also Ps. xxii. 30; xxiv. 6, and lxxiii. 15; also 1 Pet. ii. 9.

It is also applied to the *wicked* as a *class*. Matt. iii. 7: "O generation of vipers." See also Matt. xii. 24; and xxiii. 33; and Mark viii. 38; and Luke xvi. 8.

Our Lord was speaking to his children, and telling them they should be *gathered* unto him in the clouds of heaven when he should come, but tells them not to look for such an event till all the signs he had given them had first appeared; *then*, and not till then, the generation of saints should be "caught up together, to meet the Lord in the air," and thus "pass away" from earth, while the last *indignation* is poured out upon the wicked. See Isaiah xxvi. 19—21.

But after all, the difficulty in this text is not so much in the term generation as in the word "fulfilled." The word translated *fulfilled* occurs forty-eight times in the New Testament,

Digitized by Google

and in only one other connexion is it translated fulfilled, but is a word which signifies "*progression*"—"*accomplishing*"—"*not completed;*" and here signifies that before that *age* or generation should pass away, the chain of events spoken of should *commence* their accomplishment.

Once more: the expression may signify, that the generation living when the last mentioned signs, viz., those connected with the sun, moon, stars, &c., should begin, should not pass away till the whole of the signs there spoken of were fulfilled and Christ should come. Those signs commenced in 1780, and are *now* all fulfilled. What are we to look for next? The Lord Jesus Christ "*in the clouds of heaven.*"

Verse 36. This verse is supposed to form another objection: and we not unfrequently hear persons say, "Christ has said no man *shall* EVER *know* anything about his coming." And we are told that those of us who pretend to know anything about the time, "*give Christ the lie.*"

We will see presently who it is "gives the *lie*" to inspiration, *we* or our opponents. Our Lord says, "Of that day and hour *knoweth* [in the present time; not '*never shall know*'] no man," &c. *Of what* day and hour? Clearly the day and hour when the *Son of Man will be revealed.* Well, I know of no man that pretends to know the day or hour of Christ's *appearing;* I am sure I do not. "But, do you not believe the world will come to an end in 1843?" *Certainly I do:* but I believe also that our Lord will appear *before* the end of the world; for there must be some time after the Bridegroom comes for the wicked to cry for mercy and find none, before the *final conflagration of the world.* Hence Christ may appear now any hour—I know not how soon.

But again: let the objector be *true* to his principles; do not let him flinch when he is tried. He says, "Our Lord's words authorize him in saying that no man shall *ever know* anything about Christ's appearing till he *actually* comes as the lightning." Very well; now let him carry out his principles, and he proves that Christ *himself* will *never know anything about it* till he finds himself *here!!* For our Lord says, Mark xiii. 32, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven, NEITHER THE SON." If the objector is now afraid to follow out his principles, let him acknowledge he is mistaken in his interpretation of the words "no man *knoweth;*" for if it is true that no man *ever shall know,* it is equally true that the "*Son*" never shall know. Nor can he escape from the difficulty by saying, "Christ did not know it *as man,*" for it is the "*Son of Man*" that is to appear "in the clouds of heaven;" and I ask again, if he is *never to know* anything about *the time* of his appearing, till he finds himself *here?* The fact

Digitized by Google

is, the *time* was given of the end of the world in the book of Daniel, but Daniel was commanded, chap. xii. 4, "shut up the words, and seal the book, to the *time of the end;*" and at the 9th verse Daniel is told, "The words are closed up and sealed till the *time of the end;*" and then it is added, verse 10th, "Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and *none of the wicked shall understand:* but the *wise shall understand*"—when? In "*the time of the end.*" That time has come. And besides, our Saviour says, "When ye see all these things, [viz., the signs he had given them,] KNOW that it is near, at the doors." Now, who gives "Christ the lie," we, who have seen all the signs, and hence believe our Lord's words, and "*know* it is at the door," or our opponents, who declare we can know *nothing about it?* Let the candid judge.

Verses 37—39. "But as the days of Noe were, so also shall the coming of the Son of Man be. For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so also shall the coming of the Son of Man be."

Who "*knew not?*" Not Noe; for he was "warned of God" 120 years before, and being "moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house," because he believed God. But why did not the wicked world *know it?* Not because they had *not been warned,* but because they *did not believe.* Noe had warned them, and done it *practically* too, by building the ark; but they doubtless counted him a *fanatic,* a *fool,* a *madman*—called his notions all "*moonshine,*" and a "*humbug:*" and the philosophers, doubtless, reasoned wisely, at least in their own estimation, and made it clear as the sun that there was not water enough in the world to "cover the tops of the highest mountains;" and Noe was an "*ignoramus,*" or he would not talk such "*nonsense;*" and then they would *laugh at him* when the time had passed by. Thus men were deluded—the flood came and *took them all away*—and they *knew it not* till it was upon them; so will it be when Christ is revealed. Alas! deluded mortals, you will be undone, and you will not know it till it is too late for help. Your teachers cannot save you in that day! No, they themselves will cry in vain, "Lord, Lord, open unto us;" but they, too, cry too late. All is lost—and their eyes are open only to see their ruin, and the ruin of their deluded hearers. That awful day will surely come—laugh and scoff as you may—it will overtake unbelievers as a thief.

Verses 40 *and* 41: "Then two shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left. Two shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken and the other left."

Digitized by Google

Luke xvii. 34—36, it is said, "I tell you in that *night* there shall be two in *one bed;* the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two shall be in the FIELD; the one shall be taken, and the other left."

Thus it appears it will be *night* in some parts of the earth, and *day* in others. There, a *pious wife*, who has endured the scoffs of a wicked husband, *will be taken*, and *he* will be left; or a pious husband will be taken and a persecuting wife will be *left:*—there, a pious brother is taken and a wicked sister *left* —or a pious sister is taken and a scoffing brother *left:*—there, a godly parent, whose prayers, counsels, and entreaties have all been disregarded, is taken, and the wicked child *left*—or pious children are taken and ungodly parents *left:*—there, the *little babes*,—for they will go up in that day,—are taken from their wicked parents' arms, and those parents are *left!*—LEFT!! LEFT!!! *Left* to what? Not to the *next* cars, for the *last* train, that will ever run for glory, has *gone*—GONE—GONE *for ever!!! Left* to what?—Left to the *burning day:* "For behold the day cometh that *shall burn as an oven;* and all the *proud*, yea, all that do *wickedly*, shall be *stubble:* and the day that cometh shall burn them up, *saith the Lord of hosts*, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Yea, "The slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth: they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground." See Mal. iv. 1, and Jer. xxv. 33. "Left!" O ye who are sensible that you are not prepared for that burning day, why will you persist in a cold neglect of the call of God? "Prepare to meet thy God." If you persist in sin, remember the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it, Isa. xxxiii. 12: "The people shall be as the burnings of lime; AS THORNS CUT UP SHALL THEY BE BURNED IN THE FIRE."

Verses 42 *to* 44. These verses are an exhortation to duty—to "watch"—to "be ready." Some apply this to "Christ's coming at death." But the Scriptures nowhere speak of Christ's coming at death. They speak only of *two* comings of the Lord Jesus; once to seek and save that which was lost, by dying for us and rising again; and, "to them that look for him shall he appear THE SECOND TIME without sin [a sin offering] unto salvation." They teach us to look for no other coming of Christ than this. For this, we are exhorted to watch and *be ready*.

Verses 44 *to* 47. In these verses the happiness of the faithful servant is set forth. He is a "*wise* servant"—understands his Lord's words. [See Daniel xii. 10: "The wise shall understand." *When?* In "THE TIME OF THE END," verse 9.] He not only understands, but imparts knowledge; "gives

Digitized by Google

meat in due season;" warns the people; "hears the word at" God's "mouth, and warns them from" him. "Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing." He will be gloriously rewarded: "Verily I say unto you, that he shall make him ruler over all his goods."

Verses 48 *and* 49. Here the *evil* servant is described. First: He "says in his heart [dare not at first speak it out,] "My Lord DELAYETH his coming"—"Where is the promise of his coming?"—"Can't come yet"— "Must be a gathering of the Jews first"—"Must be a temporal or spiritual millennium"—"Can't come these thousand years yet." At last he speaks out; he says: "No *scholar* in the world can believe that the world is coming to an end next April. It is utterly *impossible!* IF IT DOES, THE ALMIGHTY HAS TOLD THE GREATEST LIES THAT WERE EVER UTTERED!" [See Dr. Brownlee's sermon, as reported in the New York Herald, November.] What next? "Begin to smite fellow-servants;" call them "fools," "fanatics;" they are preaching "moonshine," "humbug," &c. Then what? "Eat and drink with the drunken." Perhaps not literally. They have too much respect for their characters to do that; but they furnish just such *moral food* as wicked, ungodly men love; and they feed on it themselves. The wicked crowd to hear such ministers, and come away extolling them. A multitude of examples might be given of this; one must suffice: A minister in Massachusetts, by the name of S. B. H——, who had once been a temperance lecturer, was invited to preach against Christ's coming and the end of the world at hand, by some Universalists. After he got through, they were so well pleased, one of them gave him a ten dollar bill; another, after praising the minister, said to him, "I have no money to give, but if you will go to the tavern with me, I will TREAT YOU JUST AS LONG AS YOU CAN DRINK." Thus these evil servants furnish food for wicked, rum-drinking men, and as truly eat and drink with the drunken as though they sipped the intoxicating bowl. You never heard of a sinner awakened by a sermon preached against the doctrine of Christ's coming and the end of the world in 1843. But many who had been aroused from their sinful slumbers by the "terror" of the Lord's coming, have been lulled to sleep again by these evil servants, and will most likely sleep on till the thunders of the last trump will awake them to see that they have "*believed a lie* that they might be damned," because they received "not the truth" that they might be saved, "but had pleasure in unrighteousness." See 2 Thess. ii. 10—12.

Verses 50 *and* 51. These verses contain the doom of those evil servants who furnish food for wicked men, and partake of it themselves. "The Lord of that servant shall come in a

Digitized by Google

day WHEN HE LOOKETH NOT FOR HIM, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint *him* HIS PORTION with the HYPOCRITES; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Now, reader, this is perhaps the last address I shall ever give you. I feel that our Lord standeth at the door. Beyond a doubt, in my mind, the NEXT great prophetic event is the sounding of the LAST TRUMPET, the coming of Christ to raise his sleeping saints, change his living ones, "melt the elements with fervent heat, the earth also;" and BURN UP THE WORKS THEREIN. That will be "the DAY OF JUDGMENT AND PERDITION OF UNGODLY MEN!"

Digitized by Google